

Z
8697
L74

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



Z 8697.L74 **Cornell University Library**

Z 8697.L74

The ancient editions of Plautus.



3 1924 008 359 642

Date Due

JUN 26 1958 D O

MAY 3 1963 M P

SEP 30 1972

~~JUL 29 1996~~

~~MAR 13 2005~~

(b)

23 233



Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

THE ANCIENT EDITIONS OF PLAUTUS.

BY

W. M. LINDSAY, Hon. Ph.D. (Heidelb.)

Professor of Humanity in the University of St. Andrews.

OXFORD:

James Parker and Co.

27 BROAD STREET; AND 31 BEDFORD STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

1904.

†

17

Z

8697

L74

14450.0
11653.41413
181.88811

CONTENTS.



	PAGE
§ 1. Preliminary - - - - -	1
§ 2. Plautus-citations in Varro - - - - -	2
§ 3. Plautus-citations in Verrius Flaccus - - - - -	13
§ 4. Plautus-citations in Nonius Marcellus - - - - -	23
§ 5. Other evidence - - - - -	27
§ 6. The Ambrosian and Palatine Archetypes - - - - -	35
(I.) Lines inserted or omitted or substituted in the 'Revival' Text - - - - -	37
(II.) Phrases or words altered in the 'Revival' Text - - - - -	57
(III.) External Form of the two Editions, Colo- metry, Order of Plays, &c. - - - - -	78
(IV.) The Arguments - - - - -	86
(V.) The Didascalie - - - - -	88
(VI.) The Scenes and Scene-headings - - - - -	<i>ib.</i>
(VII.) Errors common to the two Recensions - - - - -	104
(VIII.) Hiatus - - - - -	118
(IX.) Orthography - - - - -	136
§ 7. Conclusion - - - - -	142

THE ANCIENT EDITIONS OF PLAUTUS.

§ 1. *Preliminary.*

It is not until about the fourth century A.D. that we get a clear view of the text-tradition of Plautus. But we can tap the previous flow of tradition at two points, at the time of Varro and at the time of Verrius Flaccus, and get at least a glimpse, obscured unfortunately by the fragmentary condition in which the writings of these authors have survived. It will thus be convenient to assign two separate sections in this monograph, one to the Plautine citations of Varro, and another to those of Verrius Flaccus, before proceeding to that period to which our extant MSS. can be traced back, which is also, roughly speaking, the period of the grammarian Nonius Marcellus.

For the earliest stage of all, the interval between Plautus and Varro, the information that can be gleaned is so scanty and at the same time (thanks to the work of Ritschl) so well known that it is unnecessary to give it anything more than a brief notice here. We know that the original manuscript text of a play would pass into the hands of a theatrical manager, and that until the plays became available for reading and for grammatical research, they would exist only in the form of stage copies; we know that there was a revival of Plautine Comedy in the last century of the Republic, and that the plays were re-staged^a in a more or less altered form

^a The frequently quoted prologue of the 'Casina' was written for a revival performance, which took place about a generation or more after the poet's time, as we see from vv. 11 sqq. :—

nos postquam populi rumore intelleximus
studiose expetere vos Plautinas fabulas,
anticuam eius edimus comoediam,
quam vos probastis qui estis in senioribus;
nam iuniorum qui sunt non norunt, scio.

The play was re-named 'Sortientes' (vv. 30 sqq.) :—

comoediai nomen dare vobis volo.
Clerumenoe vocatur haec comoedia
graece, latine Sortientes.

Similarly the *Mostellaria* seems to have been re-named 'Phasma,' and so

and often under a new title; we know that a number of grammarians and antiquarians (e.g. Aurelius Opilius, Ael. Stilo, Ser. Clodius) applied themselves to the discussion of the difficulties which the text offered to readers and provided the plays with glossaries of rare and obsolete words. The most enthusiastic student of the poet was Varro's teacher, L. Aelius Stilo of Praeneste, and it was probably from him that a good deal of the Plautine lore published by Varro originally came.

§ 2. *Plautus-citations in Varro.*

Of Varro's large treatise (lexicographical, grammatical, etymological), the 'De Lingua Latina,' only Books V—X have been preserved. In compiling them he seems to have largely availed himself of the 'glossarum scriptores,' and their interpretations of the difficult words in Plautus and the other early authors. The interpretations offered by Ser. Clodius, the son-in-law of Aelius Stilo, have a prominent place, also those of Aurelius Opilius and others. For example, Varro mentions the puzzling line (Plaut. frag. Nervolaria 96):

scrattae, scrupedae (?), strittibillae, sordidae,

and tells us that one grammarian wrote the second word as *scauripedae*, another (whom Varro himself seems to follow) as *scrupipedae*, a third authority differently^b. Here are Varro's words (L.L. VII 65): *scrupipedam Aurelius (i.e. Aur. Opilius) scribit, a scauripeda; Iuventius comicus dicebat a vermiculo piloso, qui solet esse in fronde cum multis pedibus; Valerius a pede ac scrupeda. The*

on (cf. Ritschl, *Parerga* I 180 sqq.). Another evidently 'Revival' prologue is that of the *Pseudolus*, found in both *A* and *P* in this brief form:—

Exporgi meliust lumbos atque exsurgier:

Plautina longa fabula in scaenam venit.

Editors suppose this couplet to be a mere fragment, the rest having been lost. I do not see why it should not be the whole prologue. The opening scene, one of the cleverest and liveliest in Plautus, explains the whole situation clearly enough, and Plautus probably never wrote a prologue for the play. The 'Revival' stage-manager would wish to announce to his audience as briefly as possible that an old favourite was being re-staged. The expression 'Plautina longa fabula' is noticeable in view of the frequent curtailment of scenes in the 'Revival' text.

^b Was it as *scripipedae*, from **scrips* (Greek σκνψ) and *pes*?

result of the grammarians' researches had apparently been to provide the line with three variant readings.

Another example of the disagreement of authorities, but whether accompanied or not by divergence of reading is not clear, we find in VII 106, where Varro speaks of the word *delicuum* in Cas. 206 :

quando tibi domi nihil delicuum est.

Varro remarks : dictum ab eo quod deliquandum non sunt (? *leg.* est), ut turbida quae sunt deliquantur ut liquida fiant, Aurelius scribit delicuum esse ab liquido ; Claudius^o ab eliquato. Siquis alterutrum sequi malet, habebit auctorem.

The same two rival authorities are quoted again in connexion with the word *praefica* (VII 70) : in Truculento :

sine virtute argutum civem mihi habeam pro praefica ;

dicta, ut Aurelius scribit, mulier, ab luco (*scil.* Veneris Libitinae) quae conduceretur quae ante domum mortui laudes eius caneret. Hoc factitatum Aristoteles scribit in libro qui inscribitur νόμιμα βαρβαρικά, quibus testimonium est quod † fretum (? *leg.* tritum) est Naevii :

haec quidem hercle opinor praefica est ; nam mortuum collaudat.

Claudius scribit : ' quae praeficeretur ancillis, quemadmodum lamentaretur, praefica est dicta.' Utrumque ostendit a praefectione praeficam dictam.

In VII 107, Varro mentions the practice of appending inter-linear (or marginal) glosses to the texts of early writers. Speaking of the word *persibus*, found in the Demetrius, a comedy of Naevius, he says : sub hoc glossema "callide" subscribunt. And in VII 64 he seems to give us a string of such glosses taken from a text of the Cistellaria and bearing on v. 407 :

diobolares, schoenicolae, miraculae.

Diobolares a binis obolis. Schoenicolae ab schoeno, nugatorio unguento. Miraculae a miris, id est monstris, a quo Accius ait personas distortis oribus deformis 'miriones.'

^o This is Ser. Clodius, son-in-law of Varro's teacher, Aelius Stilo. Did he then write *elicuum* for *delicuum* ?

We can easily imagine how marginal notes of this kind on such a line as that previously quoted :

scrattae, scrupedae, strittibillae, sordidae,

would produce in subsequent copies a variety of reading in the second word of the line. One scribe would bring from the margin into the text one of the variants mentioned, while others would give preference to a different variant.

Varro's quotations of Plautus in the 'De Lingua Latina' give us apparently the text on which previous commentators or gloss-writers based their glosses. We can therefore rely on the accuracy of these quotations, since they are taken either from actual texts edited by these scholars or, at least, from commentaries closely connected with actual texts^d. In VII 81, Varro^e cites Pseud. 955 in this form :

ut transvorsus, non provorsus cedit quasi cancer solet !

whereas our traditional reading (in *A* apparently as well as in *P*) is :
non prorsus verum ex transverso (-vor-?) cedit quasi cancer solet.

Editors have, I think rightly, given preference to Varro's setting of the line, judging that the change of the antique *provorsus* to *prorsus* was a change made at the time of the Plautine Revival, when obsolete words and phrases would naturally be re-cast in a form more intelligible to the audience of the day.

It will be well to give here a full list of all the passages of Plautus cited by Varro and a collation of them with the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*) and the Palatine archetype (*P*). It will shew that with the exception of the line just quoted, in which the 'Revival' version has found its way into *A* as well as *P*, the text used by Varro (or rather by the 'glossographi' whom he quotes) was practi-

^d It might be urged that in any case Varro's reputation as a scholar forbids us to attribute to him carelessness in quotation. Still we must remember that the present standard of accuracy is hardly applicable to a time when books were far scarcer and less accessible, and above all had not that convenient division of page and paragraph and lines which makes reference to a required passage so easy now-a-days.

^e He goes on to say: *dicatur ab eo qui in id quo <it> est versus, et ideo qui exit in vestibulum, quod est ante domum, prodire et procedere; quod cum leno non faceret, sed secundum parietem transversus iret, dixit 'ut transversus cedit quasi cancer, non provorsus ut homo.'* This sounds like the language of a person who has seen the play acted.

cally identical with the text of *A P*, even (so far as can be gathered) in respect of Hiatus and of Colometry.

Amph. 275 (L.L. VII 50, s.vv. Iugula, Vesperugo; VI 6 s.v. Vesperugo) neque Iugula neque Vesperugo^f neque Vergiliae occidunt (*iugulae P*, A n.l.).

That the second half, at least, of the line (for the two opening words are not quoted in VI 6) shews the precise form in which it appeared in the text or commentary used by Varro is absolutely certain. Varro therefore recognized the hiatus *Vergiliae | occidunt*.

? [Amph. 488 (ap. Non. § 57. 18, s.v. Enixae) uno ut labore (*vel uno labore*) exsolueret (*leg.-re?*) aerumnas duas (*uno ut labore absoluat P*, A n.l.).]

Asin. 685 (L.L. VII 79, cf. VI^h 7, s.v. Conticinnum) uidebitur, factum uoloredito conticinno (*r. huc c. P*, A n.l.).

It is difficult to decide which is the right reading. *Huc*, if written in its older form *hoc* might easily drop out in this context. On the other hand the addition (as well as the omission) of these small Adverbs and Conjunctions is a besetting sin of scribes of Plautus.

Aul. 191 (L.L. V 14, s.v. Locatum 'collocatum')

uirginem habeo grandem dote cassa (*leg. -am*) atque inlocabili (*leg. -lem*),
neque eam queo locare cuiquam (*P*, A n.l.).

Aul. 446 (L.L. VII 103, s.v. Pipulo 'convicio') pipulo teⁱ differam ante aedis (*p. hic. d. P*, A n.l.).

^f Varro says (L.L. VII 50): Vesperugo stella quae vespere oritur, a quo eam Opilius scribit Vesperum. This can hardly mean that Aurelius Opilius proposed to read *Vesperum* for *Vesperugo* in this line. Varro says elsewhere (L.L. VI 6): eum Graeci vocant *ξσπερον*, nostri Vesperuginem.

^g That Nonius has taken the quotation from Varro is doubtful. See my 'Nonius Marcellus,' pp. 16, 17.

^h The manuscript tradition of L.L. V 118—VI 61 is much weaker than that of the rest of the work. We may therefore ignore the variants in VI 7 *videbimus, conticinnio (-inio)*.

ⁱ Nonius quotes the line rightly: *pipulo te hic differam*. Varro, who does not give the whole line, seems to be quoting carelessly, being concerned more with the phrase *pipulo differre aliquem* than with the actual words of Plautus' verse. In *P*, or at least our extant MSS. of this family, the omission of *te* must be a mere scribal error, for the pronoun is required by the sense.

Aul. 526 (L.L. V 181, s.v. *Aes militare*) cedit miles, aes petit (P, A n.l.).

Cas. 206 (L.L. VII 106, s.v. *Delicuum*)

sineamesses sine (*leg. sine amet, sine*) quod lubet id facias
(*leg. -at*)

quando tibi domi nihil delicuum est (*nihil domi* P, A n.l.).

See above, p. 3.

Cas. 267 (L.L. VII 104)

Maccius in Casina a fringuilla :

quid fringuttis (*leg. frig-*)? quid istuc tam cupide cupis? (P, A n.l.).

Cist. 1 (L.L. VII 98, s.v. *Cernere*) quia ego antehac te amavi <et mihi amicam esse creui> (*cum ego* P, A n.l.).

Priscian quotes the line with *cum*, not *quia*. If the majuscule archetype of our MS. of Varro had QVM, this might easily be mistaken for QVIA.

Cist. 6, 8, 10-11 (L.L. VII 99, s.v. *Frequens*) mi frequentem operam dedistis (P, A n.l.).

Valet assiduam . . . Itaque illud quod eadem mulierculae dicunt :

<pol isto> quidem nos pretio ptanti (*leg. tanti*) est frequentare,
(*facile est* P, A n.l.)

ita in prandio nos lepide ac nitide Accepisti (P, A n.l.),

Apparet dicere : facile est curare ut adsimus, cum tam bene nos accipias.

This passage of Varro raises several questions. In our MSS. of Plautus the words omitted by Varro, *tibi utilisque habere*, form a separate line (v. 9). Varro's omission suggests that the text from which his quotation comes had the same Colometry. Again, his use of the word *facile* in his explanation of v. 8 brings his reading of the line into connexion with the reading of the Palatine MSS. But how precisely? Is *ptanti* a mere scribal error for *facile*? That seems unlikely. It can hardly be a corruption of anything else than *tanti*, the preceding *o* having suggested to a scribe *optanti*. Rather it would seem that *tanti est* was glossed by *facile est*, so that the Palatine MSS. have substituted the gloss for the original phrase.

On the other hand a phrase like *tanti est* would better suit a neuter use of *frequentare* (not the active use, 'curare ut adsimus') and the Passive *haberi* (which is actually the reading of that corrector of the Codex Vetus of Plautus [B³] whose readings are generally right). Again it is difficult to scan the line (supposing it to end with *frequentare*) either with *tanti est* or with *facile est*. The requisite metre is one which will serve as transition from the preceding trochaic passage to the following iambic, anapaestic, and bacchiac lines. All these difficulties can, I think, be solved if we suppose that Plautus wrote a trochaic Dimeter acatalectic ending in a Colon Reizianum :

pól isto quidem nos prétio tanti est (sc. 'adesse') ; facile ést
frequentáre (i.e. 'curare ut adsimus'),

and that the proximity of the two phrases *tanti est* and *facile est* led to the omission of the one or the other by ancient or mediaeval scribes.

Cist. 14-15 (L.L. V 72) Venelia a veniendo ac vento illo quem Plautus dicit :

quod ibi (leg. ille) dixit qui secundo uento uectus est tranquillo
mari,
uentum gaudeo (P, A n.l.).

Cist. 405, 407 (L.L. VII 64) In Cistellaria :

non quasi nunc haec sunt hic limaces liuidae (A ut vid.,
P n.l.).

Limax ab limo, quod ibi vivit.

diobolares, schoenicolae, miraculae (*miracula* A, P n.l.).

Diobolares a binis obolis, etc. (see above, p. 3).

Here again the words omitted by Varro form a separate line.

Curc. 236 (L.L. VII 60, s.v. Dividia, 'distractio doloris')

Sed quid tibist? Lien enecat, renes dolent, (*necat* [leg. *enecat*]
P, A n.l.)

pulmones distrahuntur.

Curc. 393 (L.L. VII 71, s.v. Cocles)

de Coclitum (Cocul-) prosapia esse arbitror, (*pros. te e.* P, A n.l.)
nam hi sunt unoculi.

The faulty omission of *te* is more probably due to the error

of some scribe (mediaeval or ancient) than to Varro's careless quotation.

Curc. 474 (L.L. V 146) Secundum Tiberim ad Iunium (Ianium *Turneb.*) Forum Piscarium vocant, ideo ait Plautus :

apud piscarium (*a. forum p.* P, A n.l.)

This passage comes from the well known 'entr' acte,' the genuineness of which is doubtful.

Curc. 566-8 (ap. Fest. 375 M., s.v. Vapula Papiria). The words of Festus' epitome of Verrius come apparently from Sennius Capito's treatise on Roman proverbs. Varro, he says, explained *vapulare* in this phrase to have the sense of *perire*, and quoted in support of this explanation a line of Terence and this passage of Plautus :

reddin an non mulierem (*virginem* P, A n.l.)

priusquam te huic meae machaerae óbicio, mastigia?

uapula ergo (*leg. uapulare* ego) te vehementer iubeo, ne me territes.

Epid. 231 (L.L. V 131, s.v. Intusium) intusiatam, patagiatam, caltulum, (*leg. -am*) ac crocotulam (*aut cr.* A P).

Since this quotation comes from that part of the 'Lingua Latina' for which we have the evidence only of Renaissance MSS., it is quite likely that Varro actually wrote *aut* and not *ac*.

Men. 127 (L.L. VII 93, s.v. Euax) euax, iurgio uxorem tandem abegi a ianua (*iu. hercle tand. ux.* P. A n.l.)

The omission of *hercle*, and the transposition of *uxorem* and *tandem* may be mere errors of a scribe. However, those who believe in the possibility of the occasional use in Plautus of the old final *d* of the Abl. Sing. can appeal to Varro's quotation of this trochaic Septenarius, and of the iambic Senarius in Curc. 393. To me it seems that the evidence of inscriptions, &c., shews that the use of this archaism would be as impossible to Plautus as the disyllabic pronunciation of *-tion* in 'nation,' 'consummation,' &c., &c. would be to an English comedian to-day.

Men. 183 (L.L. VII 56, s.v. Ascriptivi) idem istuc aliis ascriptivis fieri ad legionem solet (A P).

Men. 289 (R.R. II, i, 20, s.v. Sacres) quanti
 sunt porci sacres ?
 (R.R. II, iv, 16, s.v. Sacres) quanti hic porci sunt sacres ? } (*quibus hic pretiis
 porci ueneunt
 sacres ? AP*).

The double occurrence of the quotation in divergent form is fortunate, for it leaves no doubt that Varro is quoting carelessly from memory.

Men. 352 (L.L. VII 12, s.v. Tu domi videbis, 'domum curabis')
 intus para, cura, uide quod opus (*leg. -ust*) fiat. (P, A n.l.).

Here again Varro's colometry seems to agree with that in our MSS.

Men. 797 (L.L. VII 54, s.v. Carere) inter ancillas sedere iubeas,
 lanam carere (*carpere* [*leg. carere*] P, A n.l.).

Men. 1047 (ap. Aul. Gell. XVIII ix 4, s.v. Insecenda) Varronem
 quoque verum hunc Plauti de Menaechmis: nihilo minus (*leg.*
mihi ?) esse videtur (*leg. -entur ?*)^k sectius quam somnia (*n.e.*
mihi videntur setius [-cius] P, A n.l.), sic enarrare 'nihilo magis
 narranda esse quam si essent somnia.'

What is the meaning of Gellius' statement? Does it imply that
 Varro favoured the spelling *sectius*, or merely that Varro, in a freak
 of etymology, chose to connect the *insece* of Ennius with the Adverb
secius? Probably the latter.

Merc. 619 (L.L. VII 60, s.v. Dividia)¹ non tibi istuc magis
 diuidiaest quam mihi hodie fuit (*nec* [*leg. non ?*] t.i.m. *diuidiae est*
[leg. diuidiaest] P, A n.l.).

Here again we find that Varro recognises Hiatus. For unless we
 discard the patently genuine *diuidiaest* for *diuidiae est*, we must scan
 the second hemistich *quám mihi hodié fuit*.

Mil. 24 (L.L. VII 86, s.vv. Epityrum, Insane) si (*leg. nisi*) unum,
 epityra estuer (*leg. estur*) insane bene (*nisi unum, epityrum [-ram ?
 -ra ?]* *estur insanum bene* A: *nisi unum, epityra ut apud illa estur
 insane bene* P ut vid.).

^k Unless Varro read *hoc* and not *haec*.

¹ Varro adds: *hoc idem est in Corollaria Naevii*. So Plautus seems to have
 taken the line from Naevius, just as Terence has taken lines from Plautus
 (see below, p. 27).

Again the Hiatus (after the pause following *nisi unum*, 'but one thing I must say') is recognized by Varro. The *insanum* of *A* is Plautine, not the *insane* of Varro and *P*. The corrupt setting of the line in *P* seems due to the insertion of the variant (introduced by *vel*, misread as *ut*) *aput illa* for *epityra*. I think the construction *epityra* (Acc. Pl.) *estur* is genuine (cf. 'Lat. Lang.' viii, 63).

Most. 245 (L.L. IX 54, s.v. Nihili) uideo enim te nihili pendere prae Philolacho (*leg.* -che?) omnis homines (*enim* om. *P*, *A* n.l.).

Whether *enim* has been wrongly inserted by Varro (or a mediaeval scribe) or wrongly omitted in the Palatine archetype, cannot be determined, for the line scans equally well with or without the word. I am inclined to believe *enim* to be genuine, and its omission to be due to someone who did not know that Plautus used the word in the sense of *enimvero* and not of *namque*.

Pers. 89 (L.L. VII 55, s.v. Congerro) iam pol ille hic aderit credo congerro meus (*P*, *A* n.l.).

Poen. 530 (L.L. VII 69, s.v. Gralator) vinceretis circum curso (? *leg.* cervum cursu) vel gralatorem gradum (*leg.* -du) (*P*, *A* n.l.). Or is *circum* genuine and not a scribe's error for *cervum*? It is unfortunate that we have not the Palimpsest for this passage, so as to ascertain whether it read *circum* or *cervum*.

Poen. 1034 (L.L. V 68, s.v. Proserpere) quasi proserpens bestia (*A* *P*).

Pseud. 741 (ap. Non. 551, s.v. Murrina) Varro Anthropopoli: non modo vinum dare, sed etiam, ut Plautus ait: murrinam, passum, defritum (*leg.* -ru-?) (*AP*).

Pseud. 955 (L.L. VII 81) ut transuersus, non proversus cedit quasi cancer solet! (*non prorsus verum ex transverso cedit quasi cancer solet*, *P A* ut vid.).

Varro's version seems to be what Plautus wrote (see above, p. 4).

Trin. 455-6 (L.L. VII 57, s.v. Ferentarius) nam illum tibi (*cetera interciderunt*) (*ferentarium A* cum Varrone: *ferentaneum P*).

Trin. 886 (L.L. VII 78, s.v. Concubium) concubium sit noctis priusquam postremum perveneris (*pr. ad. pos.* P, A n.l.).

Whether the omission of *ad* is to be ascribed to Plautus or to Varro or to a scribe is not clear.

Truc. 22 (L.L. VI 11, s.v. Aetas) non omnis aetas ad perdiscendum est satis (*sat est* P, A n.l.).

This quotation occurs in that part of the 'Lingua Latina' for which we have the evidence only of Renaissance MSS.

Truc. 322-3 (L.L. IX 106, s.v. Lavo et Labor)

piscis ego credo, qui usque dum vivunt lavant,
diu minus lavari quam haec lavat Phronesium (*lavare*
P, A n.l.).

Varro points out the incongruity of the Deponent *lavari* with the Active *lavant*, and hints at the possibility of *lavari* being a scribe's error for *lavare*. He selects this line, I fancy, because it was a common topic of grammarians and 'glossographi.' To them the other reading *lavere* may be due.

Truc. 495 (L.L. VII 70, s.v. Praefica) sine uirtute argutum ciuem mihi habeam pro praefica (P, A n.l.).

See above, p. 3.

What order of the plays was observed by these gloss-writers in their Plautus citations is not distinctly shewn in Varro's excerpts from their glosses. But a batch of glosses from Naevius points to alphabetical^m grouping (L.L. VII 107):

Multa apud poetas reliqua esse verba quorum origines possint dici non dubito, ut apud Naevium in Aesiona mucro gladii 'lingula' a lingua; in Clastidio 'vitulantes' a vitula; in Dolo 'caperrata fronte' a caprae fronte; in Demetrio 'persibus' a perite; itaque sub hoc glossema 'callide' subiungunt; in Lampadione 'protinam' a protinus, continuitatem significans; in Nagidone 'clucidatus' suavis, tametsi a magistris accepimus mansuetum; in Romulo 'sponsus' contra sponsum rogatus; in Stigmatia 'praebia' a praebendo ut sit tutus, quod sint remedia

^m Not quite what we should call in alphabetical order, but rather in consecutive letter-sections.

in collo pueris; in Technico 'confictant' a conficto convenire dictum; in Tarentilla 'lucidum' a luce illustre; in Tunicularia 'exbolas aulas quassant,' quae eiciuntur, a Graeco verbo ἐκβολή dictum; in Bello Punico 'nec satis sardare' ab serare dictum, id est aperire; hinc etiam sera qua remota fores panduntur.

About the text used by Varro himself we can learn nothing, since his Plautus citations occur mainly in the 'de Lingua Latina,' and are there taken from the gloss-writers who drew from the whole field of early literature, Naevius and the other dramatists, as well as Plautus and of Plautus the spuriousⁿ as well as the twenty-one plays of our traditional text. But there is a statement of Aulus Gellius from which we might draw the inference^o that if a collected edition (or editions) of Plautus was in circulation at Varro's time, it would include only these twenty-one. Gellius tells us that the name 'fabulae Varroniana' was given to these (N.A. III iii. 3): quas idcirco a ceteris segregavit quoniam dubiosae non erant sed consensu omnium Plauti esse censebantur. Aelius Stilo, Varro's teacher, seems to have favoured a slightly larger list of twenty-five plays, and we hear of other 'indices' drawn up by various Plautine scholars, Sedigitus, Ser. Claudius, Aurelius Opilius, etc. (Gell. l.c.), the most notable being the 'index' of Accius, from which an extract^p, quoted by Varro in his lost work 'de comoediis Plautinis,' has been preserved. Possibly the twenty-one plays, the accepted plays of Varro's time, were merely those which were common to all these 'indices.' Varro himself, as we learn from Gellius, was inclined to add one or two other plays to the accepted twenty-one. It may be that in this matter, as in so many others, he followed Aelius Stilo. But whether he would have ventured to include these others, if he were asked by a bookseller of the time to furnish an edition of Plautus, we cannot say. There are plenty

ⁿ Varro is merely reproducing the diction of these 'glossographi' in phrases like 'in Astraba Plautina' (L.L. VI 73), 'apud Plautum in Parasito Pigro' (VII 77); so it is not right to infer from his quotation of Curc. 474 (see above, p. 8) that he regarded the 'entr' acte' in the Curculio as genuine.

^o For an entirely different inference drawn from the same statement see Leo, 'Plaut. Forsch.' p. 18.

^p The true interpretation of the extract has been furnished by Leo. Accius rejected the plays whose title-pages shewed the words: (1) Plauti Gemini Lenones; Plauti Condalius; Plauti Anus; (2) Bis Compressa; Boeotia; (3) Titi Macci Agroeus; Titi Macci Commorientes.

of Shakespearian scholars to-day with a predilection for this or that play outside of the select list included in popular editions, who would not venture to indulge their personal feelings in print.

§ 3. *Plautus-citations in Verrius Flaccus.*

Like the 'de Lingua Latina' of Varro, the 'de Verborum Significatu' of Verrius Flaccus, the leading grammarian of the Augustan age and the tutor of Augustus' grandsons, drew its materials (at least in part) from the 'glossarum scriptores.' We may then look to Verrius' encyclopaedia as well as to Varro's linguistic treatise for a sight of the Plautine text of the editors and glossary-writers of the last century of the Republic. In the 'de Lingua Latina' we found Ser. Clodius, the son-in-law of Varro's teacher, Aelius Stilo, figuring (along with Aurelius Opilius and others) as a source of information about the diction of Plautus. In the 'de Verborum Significatu' the name of Aurelius Opilius is similarly prominent.

But the composition of Verrius' encyclopaedia is too complicated and the extant relics too meagre to allow us to follow the same plan as with the 'de Lingua Latina.' We cannot safely collect all the passages of Plautus cited by Verrius and accept them as a fragment of the Plautine text of Republican early editions. In the first place, most of the 'de Verborum Significatu' is known to us only in the epitome compiled by Paulus Diaconus at the time of Charlemagne; and it is notorious that the Carolingian editor has woefully mangled the quotations. His epitome was not extracted from Verrius' work itself, but from an epitome made in the reign of Tiberius by Pompeius Festus. Of Festus' epitome we have only a fragment preserved. In respect of arrangement, the encyclopaedia contrasts unfavourably (that is, for our present purpose) with Varro's linguistic treatise. While in the 'de Lingua Latina' we have paragraphs which give us a complete, if concise, discussion of a difficult line, we have in our meagre relics of the 'de Verborum Significatu' the same information supplied piecemeal in different parts of the work. Take, as example, the paragraph of Varro (quoted on p. 3) dealing with Cist. 407 :—

Diobolares, schoenicolae, miraculae.

"Diobolares a binis obolis. Schoenicolae ab schoeno, nugatorio unguento. Miraculae a miris, id est monstris, a quo Accius ait

personas distortis oribus deformis 'miriones.'" Verrius makes us seek out the same information in different parts of his encyclopaedia:

(1) in the D-section (on p. 74 of Mueller's edition) (Paul.⁹) "Diobolares meretrices dicuntur, quae duobus obolis ducuntur."

(2) in the M-section (p. 123 M.) (Paul.) "Miracula, quae nunc digna admiratione dicimus, antiqui in rebus turpibus utebantur."

(3) in the S-section (p. 329 M.) (Fest.) "Schoeniculas app<ellare *videtur*^r mere> triculas Plautus propter usum un<guenti schoeni> quod est pessimi generis. Itaque <dixit: *Diobolares schoeniculae mi*>raculae, Cum extertis <*talis cum todillis crusculis*>.

Idem : prosedas pistorum <*amicas*, ^{*reginas*}
^{*reliquias*}> *alicarias*>, Miseras schoeno dili<*butas*, *servilicolas*, *sordid*>as."

For the line of the Poenulus (266) just quoted we get our information from Verrius not in one handy paragraph, as Varro would give it us, but under two different letter-sections^s:

(1) (p. 226 M.) (Paul.) Prosedas meretrices Plautus appellat, quae ante stabula sedeant. Eaedem et prostibula.

(2) (p. 7 M.) (Paul.) Alicariae meretrices dicebantur in Campania solitae ante pistrina alicariorum versari quaestus gratia, sicut hae, quae ante stabula sedebant, dicebantur prostibula.

Similarly, while we have in the 'de Lingua Latina' different versions of a line of Plautus discussed together, e.g. (see above, p. 2), in one and the same paragraph the three variants *scauripedae* of Aurelius Opilius, *scripipedae* (?) of Juventius, *scrupipedae* of Valerius, the arrangement in the 'de Verborum Significatu' is alphabetical and not logical. Here are some examples :

⁹ *i.e.* this part is preserved only in the Carolingian epitome. So we have presumably merely a particle of what Verrius actually wrote.

^r When the gaps in our MS. of Festus cannot be supplied with certainty by the help of Paulus Diaconus, I print the conjectural supplement in italics. All that Paulus conserves of this paragraph is: Schoeniculae appellantur meretrices propter usum unguenti schoeni quod est pessimi generis.

^s A rare exception is the paragraph compiled from notes on Plaut. Aul. 510 :
Flammarii, carinarii, violarii.
(p. 89 M.) (Paul.) "Flammarii, infectores flammei coloris. Violarii violacii dicuntur.

It seems to have escaped the process of sorting out the materials for the several letter-sections, although possibly the second item was also entered in the V-section of Verrius and even of Festus.

Truc. 271 Quia tibi suaso infecisti propudiosa pallulam (with variants *suaso* and *insuaso*).

(1) (p. 302 M.) (Fest. ^t) "Suasum colos appellatur, qui fit ex stillicidio fumoso in vestimento albo. Plautus : quia tibi suaso infecisti propudiosa pallulam. Quidam autem legunt 'insuaso.' Nec desunt qui dicant omnem colorem qui fiat inficiendo suasum vocari, quod quasi persuadetur in alium ex albo transire."

(2) (p. 111 M.) (Paul.) "Insuasum appellabant colorem, similem luteo, qui fiebat ex fumoso stillicidio."

Cist. 408 cum extritis talis, cum todillis crusculis (with variants *todillis* or *-ellis*, from *todus*, the name of some thin-legged bird, and *crotilis*, connected with *succrotilla vox*; 'a shrill voice').

(1) (p. 352 M.) (Fest.) "Todi sunt <genus avium parvarum> quarum meminit Plautus in Sy<ra : cum extor>tis talis cum todillis crus<culis> "

(2) (p. 301 M.) (Fest.) "Succrotilla tenuis diceba<tur et alta vox>. Titinnius in . . . : <feminina> fabulare succro<tilla vocula. Afra>nus in Epistola : . . . <succro>tilla voce serio. <Plautus in de>scribendis mulie<rum cruribus> gracilibus in Syr<a : cum extortis> talis cum sodellis ^u cr<usculis. Belle, quae non pedibus valerent."

(3) (p. 52 M.) (Paul.) "Crotillum, valde exile. Plautus : extortis talis cum crotillis crusculis."

Epid. 620 sed quis haec est muliercula et ille gravastellus qui uenit? (with variants *gravastellus* from γραῦς (?) and *ravistellus* from *ravus* 'grey').

(1) (p. 96 M.) (Paul.) "Gravastellus, senior. Plautus : qui est gravastellus qui advenit? [Ut puto, gravastellus a gravitate dictus]."

(2) (p. 273 M.) (Fest.) "<Ravi coloris> appellantur <qui sunt inter flavos et caesios> . . . ravo sub con . . . quod genus hominum <Plautus appellat ravistellos> : sed quis haec est <mulier et ille ravistellus, qui> uenit?"

^t Festus gives us only an epitome of Verrius, but contrast his fulness with the meagreness of Paulus Diaconus : Suasum colos appellatur qui fit ex stillicidio fumoso in vestimento albo. Plautus : 'suaso infecisti propudiosa pallulam.'

^u Read *todellis*. But it looks as if there had been an omission through Homoeoteleuton, e.g. <cum crotillis crusculis ; quanquam alii dicunt> cum todellis crusculis, etc.

Mil. 1180 id conexum in umero laeuo, exfaillato bracchio (with variants *exfaillato* and *expapillato*).

(1) (p. 79 M.) (Paul.) "Expapillato brachio, exerto, quod quum fit, papilla nudatur."

(2) (p. 83 M.) (Paul.) "Effafilatum, exertum, quod scilicet omnes exerto brachio sint exfilati, id est extra vestimentum filo contextum."

The Ambrosian Palimpsest seems to supply us with a third variant, *expalliolo*. In Varro's hands the information would probably have been supplied in the same shape as his account of the three variants in another line (see above, p. 2), *scauripedae*, *scripipedae* (?), and *scrupipedae*. He would have compressed it somewhat in this fashion: Expapillato A. scribit, a papilla; B. expalliolo, a palliolo; C. exfaillato, a filo."

The identity of the materials used by Varro and Verrius is indicated by some of the Plautus-lemmas mentioned above. It is even more striking in some un-Plautine lemmas. Compare, for example, Varro L.L. VII 35 "Apud Ennium:—

Subulo quondam marinas propter astabat plagas.

Subulo dictus quod ita dicunt tibicines Tusci; quocirca radices eius in Etruria non Latio quaerundae," with this lemma in Festus' epitome of Verrius (p. 309 M.) "Subulo Tusce tibicen dicitur. Itaque Ennius:

Subulo quondam marinas propter adstabat plagas."

Both Varro and Verrius take both word and citation from the same 'glossographi.'

The Plautine citations however in the 'de Verborum Significatu' do not all come from these gloss-writers. Not a few can be traced directly to Sennius Capito's collection of Roman proverbs, a book from which Verrius drew a large amount of material for his encyclopaedia, e.g., (1) Cas. 524 (p. 310 M.) (Fest.) "Su<trium Quasi Eant ut>ique in proverbium <abiit ex hac causa>. Gallico tu<multu quon>dam edictum est, legiones Sutrii ut praesto essent cum cibo suo. Quod usurpari coeptum est in is, qui suis rebus opibusque officii quid praestarent, quibus deberent. Plautus: sed facitodum, merula per uersus quod cantat colas, Cum suo cuique facito ueniant, quasi eant Sutrium." (2) Epid. 592 (p. 230 M.) (Fest.) Plaustrum

Perculi, etc. Others are patently incidental references to Plautus made by grammarians in the course of their discussion of a difficult line in some other author, or of a difficult or interesting Latin word.

Now we have already seen in the case of Varro how careless and inaccurate these chance citations may be. The Plautus citations in the 'de Lingua Latina,' taken from glossaries and commentaries immediately connected with a Plautine text, are reliable^x; but when Varro, careful scholar though he was, in his work on Husbandry makes casual reference in two places (R.R. II i. 20 and II iv. 16) to a line of Plautus (Men. 289: quibus hic pretiis porci ueneunt Sacres?), he is anything but accurate, giving two different, but equally wrong, versions: *quanti sunt porci sacres?* and *quanti hic porci sunt sacres?* It would be ludicrously absurd for us to take these two versions seriously, as if Varro had transferred them directly from the pages of a copy or copies of Plautus. He is obviously quoting carelessly from memory. But there will be later, in the section dealing with Nonius, a more convenient opportunity of remarking the distinction between quotations taken from a text or from a commentary based on a text on the one hand, and mere casual references to a line of an alien author on the other. Here I need merely say that it is of the utmost importance for us to discriminate, if we can, these two kinds of Plautus-citation in Verrius. The casual citations by memory must not be allowed to suggest to our minds a variety of text which had no real existence.

Unfortunately it is not so easy in the case of Verrius as in the case of Nonius to decide which Plautus-citations are reliable and which are not. We can without hesitation assign to careless quotation from memory a citation like that of Aul. 555, Argus qui oculus totus fuit (I quote the whole paragraph):

(p. 178 M.) (Fest.) Oculissimum, <carissi>mum, ostium amicae <Plautus dixit>; item <oculissi>me dixit, signifi<cans carissime, idem in> Pseudolo oculatum pro prae<senti posuit, cum dixit; emi>to die caeca hercule. . . . Idem alibi oculatum Ar<gum dixit>. . . . Idem: pluris est ocu<latus testis unus quam auriti decem>, id est qui se vidisse di<cat>.

^x Even this cannot be said without reserve. In V 7 *clamide clupeat brachium* is apparently a curtailed version of Pacuvius' line (ap. Non. 87 M.):
currum liquit, clamide contorta astu clupeat brachium.

Here it is clear that *oculatus*, unless it be a scribe's corruption of *oculeus*, is a mere hazy reminiscence suggested by the other occasions on which Plautus uses this form (cf. p. 21 below).

Again we may safely attribute to Paulus' inaccurate curtailment the forms assumed by (1) Trin. 721 (*video caculam militarem me futurum haud longius*), (2) Men. prol. 12 (*non atticissat verum sicilicissat*), (3) Rud. 535-6 (*Quid si aliquo ad ludos me pro manduco locem? Quapropter? Quia pol. clare crepito dentibus*), (4) Rud. 576 (*tegillum eccillud, mihi unum id aret; id si vis dabo*):—

(1) (p. 45 M.) (Paul.) *Cacula, servus militis. Plautus: video caculam militarem* ^v.

(2) (p. 28 M.) (Paul.) *Atticissat, Attice loquitur. Plautus: 'non atticissat, sed sicilicissat (-issat MSS.);'* id est Sicule loquitur.

(3) (p. 128 M.) (Paul.) *Manduci effigies in pompa antiquorum inter ceteras ridiculas formidolosasque ire solebat magnis malis ac late dehiscens et ingentem sonitum dentibus faciens, de qua Plautus ait: Quid si ad ludos me pro manduco locem? Quapropter? Clare crepito dentibus.*

(4) (p. 366 M.) (Paul.) *Tegillum, cucullunculum ex scirpo factum. Plautus: tegillum mihi aret; id, si vis, dabo.*

These instances will make us hesitate before seriously attributing to an actual divergence of text the following quotations:—

Aul. 162-4 (s. Postumus, p. 238 M.) (Fest.):

Post mediam aetatem qui media ducit uxorem domum,
Si eam senex anum praegnatem fortuito fecerit,
Quid dubitas quin sit paratum his nomen pueris Postume? (*p. nomen puero P, A n.l.*).

Aul. 354-5 (s. Temetum, p. 364 M.) (Fest.):

Cererin, Strobile, has sunt facturi nuptias?
Qui? Quia temeti nihil allatum uideo ^z (*intellego P, A n.l.*).

^v As bad an example of the neglect of the punctuation of the sentence is the citation of Stich. 352 (s. nassiterna, p. 169 M.) (Fest.): *ecquis huc effert nassiternam cum aqua sine suffragio?* The senseless curtailment of the quotation should be ascribed to Festus rather than to Verrius Flaccus.

^z Macrobius (Sat. III 77) also has *video*. He may have borrowed from

Mil. 213 (s. Comoedice, p. 61 M.) (Paul.):

Euge, euscheme adstetisti et dulice et comoedice (*eusch. hercle astitit* P, A n.l.).

(On Curc 566-8, see above, p. 8.)

In nearly all ^a the other cases the Plautus citations in our relics of Verrius' great work agree with the text of our extant MSS. of Plautus.

Where Festus' epitome is extant we can often make a guess regarding the source from which a Plautus-citation has come. Take for example the paragraph on the word *naucum* (p. 166 M.):

Naucum ait Ateius Philologus poni pro nugis. Cincius, quod in oleae . . . nucisque intus sit. Aelius Stilo, omnium rerum putamen. Glossematorum autem scriptores, fabae grani quod haereat in fabulo. Quidam ex Graeco, quod sit *ναὺ καὶ οὐχί*, levem hominem significari. Quidam nucis iugulandis, quam Verrius iugulandam vocat, medium velut dissaepimentum. Plautus in Parasito Pigno: ambo magna laude lauti, postremo ambo sumus non nauci. Item in Mostellaria: quod id esse dicam verbum, nauci, nescio. Et in Truculento: amas hominem non nauci. Et Naevius in Tunicularia: eius noctem nauco ducere. Et Ennius: illic est nugator, nihili, non nauci homo.

Verrius, although indeed Mueller in his edition of Festus doubts whether the word actually occurred in the Festus MS., of which we have for this part only a Renaissance apograph.

^a The chief exceptions are:

Bacch. 888 (s. Naenia, p. 161 M.) (Fest.) reddam u<bi> (*faciam si* P, A n.l.).

Cas. 443 (s. Nepa, p. 164 M.) (Paul.; cf. Fest.) dabo me ad parietem, imitabor nepam (*cedam ad* P, A n.l.), and the other lines already mentioned on pp. 17 sqq.

The quotation of Amph. 275 is interesting (s. Vesperugo, p. 368 M.) (Paul.) nec Vesperugo nec Vergiliae occidunt, for it exhibits the line with the same hiatus *Vergiliae | occidunt* as appears in Varro's citation (p. 5) and in our extant MSS. So is the quotation of Cas. 443, a double setting of which is suggested by a reference to Nonius, p. 145.

(1) recessim dabo me ad parietem, imitabor nepam (the Plautine version).

(2) retrorsum cedam ad parietem, imitabor nepam (the 'Revival' version).

Nonius has *retrorsum cedam ad*, but the Palatine MSS. of Plautus (A n.l.) *recessim cedam ad*, which seems to be a scribe's perversion of:

recessim

retrorsum cedam ad,

the suprascript variant having ousted the reading in the text.

Sinnius Capito is mentioned in the paragraph on the O. Lat. use of *nec* (p. 162 M.) in which a quotation from the *Mostellaria* (here called the 'Phasma') occurs^b:

Nec coniunctionem grammatici fere dicunt esse disiunctivam, ut 'nec legit nec scribit,' cum, si diligentius inspiciatur, ut fecit Sinnius Capito, intellegi possit, eam positam esse ab antiquis pro non, ut in XII (*sc.* Tab.) est: ast ei custos nec escit. Item: si adorat furto, quod nec manifestum erit. Et apud Plautum in *Phasmate* (= *Most.* 240): nec recte si illi dixeris. Et *Turpilius* in *Demetrio*: nec recte dici mihi qui iam dudum audio.

Aurelius Opilius is apparently the source of the quotation of *Mil.* 94 (p. 375 M.):

Valgos Opilius Aurelius aliique complures aiunt dici, qui diversas suras habeant. Plautus in *Milite Glorioso*: maiorem partem uideas ualgis sauiis. Et in *Sitellitergo*: si ea mihi insignitos pueros pariat postea, Aut uarum aut ualgum aut compernem aut paetum aut bocchum filium.

Whether we shall ever be able to bring the analysis of Verrius' encyclopaedia to the same degree of certainty as the analysis of Nonius Marcellus' *Compendiosa Doctrina*, and assign each paragraph and each quotation to a definite source, remains to be seen. For the present we must content ourselves with Reitzenstein's careful and judicious sketch^c of its composition. We may

^b Was it from the same grammatical treatise of Sinnius Capito that the paragraph on the O. Lat. use of *super* (p. 305 M.) was taken? There too we find a quotation from the *Mostellaria* referred to 'Phasma.'

^c Contained in 'Verrianische Forschungen' (Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen I iv), Breslau, 1887. The main points are these. The letter-sections (the A-section, the B-section, &c.), consist nearly always of two parts, of which the first is arranged alphabetically (by A B—or A B C—), while in the second the various items stand in the order in which they were entered by Verrius from the source from which he took them. The authorities used in the compilation of Parts I were apparently: Aelius Gallus 'de Significatione Verborum quae ad Ius Civile pertinent' (a glossary of legal terms), Aelius Stilo's glossary to the *Carmina Saliorum*, etc., Santra 'de Verborum Antiquitate' (a glossary of early Latin), Cincius 'de Verbis Priscis' (a glossary of early Latin), Cornificius 'de Etymis Deorum' (an etymological glossary of mythology), Varro, Aurelius Opilius, Ateius Philologus 'Liber Glossematorum' (a glossary of early Latin literature), and perhaps Cloatius 'Verba a Graecis tracta' (a list of Greek loan-words in Latin). For Part II the authorities were: Ateius Capito and Antistius Labeo (authors of several legal text-books), Veranius 'de Verbis Pontificalibus' (the priests' 'vade mecum'), Varro 'Antiquitates Rerum Hu-

regard as certain one detail of this sketch which is of special importance to us in our investigation. The earlier paragraphs of Parts II often contain series of words which seem to come directly from a Plautine text (or commentary), and which therefore probably follow the order in which they occurred in the plays^d. Unfortunately these Plautus-series appear in those portions of the encyclopaedia for which our MS. of Festus' epitome is defective. We have to fall back upon the epitome of Paulus Diaconus, which suppresses, as a rule, the citations of lines, and so reduces and alters the paragraphs that we cannot be sure of their original import. However, it will be worth while to give a list of the Plautus-citations which come from these Plautus-series, and indicate their agreement or disagreement with our extant MSS. :

manarum' and 'de Vita Populi Romani' (text-books of public and private Roman Antiquities), and perhaps Messalla 'Explanatio Auguriorum' (an account of the technical terms used in augury). The Parts II begin with lists of words taken from certain early Roman authors, (1) Ennius, (2) C. Gracchus, (3) Cato, (4) Plautus, (5) Naevius.

The most probable explanation (given by Goetz in Berl. Phil. Woch. 1887, p. 1152) of the different arrangement of Parts I and Parts II is that Verrius drew his materials for Parts I (in which alphabetical arrangement holds) from glossaries which were themselves alphabetically arranged, but for Parts II from (1) texts of early authors (or commentaries upon texts), (2) treatises on law, antiquities, grammar, &c. It should be added that the two parts must not be too rigorously dissociated, for there are traces of items, which properly belong to Parts II, having been worked into Parts I. Some letter-sections have no Parts II.

^d The clearest example is in the A-section (p. 28 M.) (Paul.) :

- (= Aul. 50) "Adaxint, adegerint.
- (= Aul. 555) Argus oculus. Argus nomen est hominis qui fuisse fingitur oculis plenus.
- (? = Cas. 1001) Amasso, amavero.
- (?? = Cist. 115) Amiculum, genus vestimenti, a circumiectu dictum.
- (? = Mil. 1004) Adlivescit (*leg.* lib-?), livere (*leg.* lib-?) incipit. [hoc est lividum fierit.]
- (= Men. prol. 12) Atticissat, Attice loquitur. Plautus : non atticissat, sed sicilicissat. Id est, Sicule loquitur.
- (= Poen. 1290) Atritas (*leg.* -tus), atri coloris.
- (= Poen. 1291) Aegyptinos, Aethiopas.
- (? = Rud. 525) Advelitatio iactatio quaedam verborum figurata ab hastis velitaribus. Velites dicuntur expediti milites, quasi volantes."

Bacch. 476 (s. Creduas, p. 60 M.) (Paul.) *ipsus nec amat nec tu creduas* (P, A n.l.).

Bacch. 1088 (s. Blenni, p. 35 M.) (Paul.) *stulti, stolidi, fatui, fungi, bardi, blenni, bucones* (P, A n.l.).

Cas. 837 (s. Corculum, p. 61 M.) (Paul.) *ego sum liber, Meum corculum, melliculum, uerculum* (P, A n.l.).

Men. prol. 12 (s. Atticissat, p. 28 M.) (Paul.) *non atticissat sed sicilicissat* (*uerum* P, A n.l.).

Mil. 213 (s. Comoedice, p. 61 M.) (Paul.) *euge euscheme adstetisti et dulice et comoedice* (*eus. hercle astitit* P, A n.l.).

The two variants are probably due to Paulus, and cannot safely be ascribed to Verrius Flaccus himself.

These Plautus-series contain as many quotations from the spurious plays as from the twenty-one 'fabulae Varroniana.' That these last were arranged in alphabetical groups (as in our extant MSS.) there is some evidence. Thus in the specimen given above (p. 21) the order apparently is: Aul., Cas., (?) Cist., Mil., Men., Poen., Rud. But what the order was within each alphabetical group, and how the spurious plays were arranged relatively to the others we cannot say. Indeed there are strong indications of a double Plautus-series in Parts II, due, probably, to Verrius' use of two distinct texts or commentaries. But the evidence is far too defective to enable us to pronounce any certain judgment^e.

Nor, so far as I can see, can we glean any information from the Plautus-citations of Verrius (whether within these Plautus-series

^e Reitzenstein for once seems to step outside of his usual limits of caution in his treatment of these Plautus-series. For example he refers the lemma *Cavitio* (p. 61 M. Paul. : *Cavitionem dicebant, quam modo dicimus cautionem*) to Bacch. 597, in which line (as in several others) the word *cautio* occurs, and infers that this lemma should stand after the following lemma *Consuetionem* (*Consuetionem Plautus pro consuetudine dixit*), because the latter clearly belongs to Amph. 490: *et clandestina ut celetur consuetio*. But why should not the lemma *cavitio* have come from a note on, let us say, the form *fauitores* (for *fautores*) used in the prologue of the *Amphitruo*? And what grounds are there for recognizing three Plautus-series, rather than two, in both of which the spurious plays are represented after the Varronian? From the form (in Paulus' epitome) of the lemma-word *Advelitatio*, he infers (p. 62 n.) that Verrius regarded *ad velitationem* as one word in Rud. 525:

equidem me ad velitationem exerceo.

But may not Verrius' lemma have been headed *Ad velitationem exercere*, and may not its form in Paulus' epitome be one of the numerous cases in which the Carolingian monk has mangled the lemma-words of his original?

of Parts II, or in other portions of the book) regarding the arrangement of the Cantica in the texts from which the citations come. One instance of a difference in the nomenclature of the plays has already been mentioned. In two paragraphs ^f the *Mostellaria* is referred to as the 'Phasma,' although in another instance ^g (p. 166 M.), quoted on p. 19, above, the usual name is given.

The two references (*s. Osculana Pugna*, *Osculum*, p. 197 M., *Fest.*, and *s. Nassiterna*, p. 169 M., *Fest.*) to the *Stichus* as the 'Nervolaria' have not been satisfactorily explained. But the two references to *Cist.* 408 (see above, p. 15) by the words *Plautus in Syr<a>* suggest that 'Syr' (the name of a 'lena' in the play?) was actually a second title, just as 'Phasma' was the title adopted at the revival of the *Mostellaria*. The words might also, but less naturally, be understood as 'Plautus speaking in the character of Syr.' Cf. *Fulgentius Exp. Serm.* (s.v. *Istega*): *sicut Plautus ait in Crisalo (i.e., Bacch. 278, spoken by Chrysalus).*

§ 4. *Plautus-citations in Nonius Marcellus.*

Nonius Marcellus, who lived in the small town of Thubursicum in North Africa, perhaps in the fourth century, compiled a large Dictionary of Republican Latin, the *Compendiosa Doctrina*, in 20 books, with copious quotations from the older writers. By a singular piece of good fortune this compilation has been left in such a state that we are able to analyse it with minute thoroughness into its component parts. We can tell with a quite extraordinary degree of precision what works of what authors were read and excerpted by Nonius himself, and what quotations he took from marginal commentaries on these authors, or from previous lexicographical writers; and we can trace almost every quotation in his Dictionary to its actual source ^h. The Republican authors

^f Both taken from *Sinnius Capito*? (see above, p. 20).

^g The play is cited only four times in all, once without a title. There is hardly any significance in the fact that it is the *Mostellaria* which is (with the *Vidularia*) the play least in evidence in *Nonius Marcellus'* dictionary. Other plays (e.g. *Amph.*, *Asin.*) seem also to have been very meagrely represented in the encyclopaedia of *Verrius Flaccus*, although *Nonius* makes copious use of them (see p. 25, below).

^h The details need not be given here. A full analysis will be found in No. I of this series of publications.

used by Nonius himself were presumably those whose works (in whole or in part) were available for him in the library of Thubursicum or on his own book-shelves. The lexicographical writers from whom he borrowed included certainly Aulus Gellius and possibly Verrius Flaccus (or Festus); the names of the others are unknown to us, for Nonius, unlike Verrius, never mentions his authorities.

This newly attained insight into the construction of the *Compendiosa Doctrina* has removed a number of misconceptions. It used to be argued that, because the language of Nonius in the discussion of this or that word resembled the language used by some other grammarian, both must have drawn from a common source. Or again that the absence or paucity of quotations from this or that author (or a particular portion of his works) implied that his works (or that particular portion of them) had disappeared from the book-market. In the case of Plautus the great preponderance of quotations from the first three plays (*Amphitruo*, *Asinaria*, *Aulularia*) was used as evidence in a way we now see to have been unwarranted. Now that we can almost claim to know the exact source from which Nonius has drawn each item of information, we can decide whether the resemblance between his language and that of other grammarians is accidental or not. We can see that the paucity of quotations from, let us say, certain books of Sisenna's *History* or of Varro's *Treatise on Husbandry* was really due to the mere accident that Nonius' library (or the library of his town) contained only Sisenna *Hist.* III-IV and Varro *R.R.* I. And not only are these misconceptions removed in the case of Nonius. We can now gauge the likelihood and unlikelihood of similar inferences that have been made regarding any other lexicographical and grammatical writer (e.g. Charisius, Diomedes, Priscian), the construction of whose materials still defies analysis. I am afraid that the result must be to expose the weakness of the premises on which inferences regarding these Grammarians have been based by recent writers. Now that we know the facts about Nonius, we can see how erroneous similar inferences would be in his case.

As regards Plautus, Nonius had two copies available¹. On

¹ We have therefore no right to assume that the non-Varronian plays had disappeared from the book-market by Nonius' time. All we can say is that

contained all the twenty-one 'Varronian' plays, the other merely the first three. He excerpted his smaller copy (text and commentary) with more thoroughness than the other, and this is the sole and simple reason for the preponderance of quotations from the *Amphitruo*, *Asinaria* and *Aulularia*. There is no evidence (rather the contrary) of any difference of text in the two copies. The number of excerpts that he made in his reading of these plays was so considerable that we get a very satisfactory view of the text used in N. Africa in the fourth (?) century. I have published elsewhere^k a full list of them, from which it will be seen that this text, while not identical with either of the two texts in our extant MSS., was by no means radically different, and that the theory of a 'third recension' receives no support from the *Compendiosa Doctrina*. What gave rise to this theory was the frequent divergence from our MSS. in a number of the Plautus-citations in Nonius. But our analysis reveals this significant fact, that these discrepant citations do not, as a rule, come from Nonius' copies of Plautus, but were taken by Nonius from alien sources, from the marginal commentary on this or that author or from one of his lexicographical authorities. They are therefore likely to be mere chance citations that never were taken directly from any text, and to have practically no authority. An example is *Men.* 94 :

Ita istaec nimis lenta vincla sunt escaria (P, etiam A ut vid.),

which appears in Nonius (p. 108 M.) as :

Ea enim fere lenta vincla sunt escaria.

He has taken the quotation here from the marginal commentary in his copy of Varro's *Treatise on Education*. *Aul.* 116 is quoted rightly (in agreement with our MSS.) at p. 476 M. :

adsunt, consistunt, copulantur dexteras,

where we know it to come from Nonius' own copy, but in another shape at 479 M., where it comes from one of his lexicographical

at *Thubursicum* Nonius could not (or at least did not) use a copy of them for personal inspection.

^k In 'Philologus' of this year.

authorities. Cas. 267 is at p. 7 M. cited from Nonius' own copy and has the same form as it has in our MSS., but the line appears in a different form at p. 308, where Nonius took it from the marginal commentary in his copy of Afranius, to be precise, from a note on Afran. Privign. 245 R. The list need not be extended. Nothing that the newly-found analysis of Nonius' Dictionary has taught us is more instructive than this discrimination between the accurate quotations, agreeing with our extant MSS., which come from an actual text of Plautus, and the inaccurate quotations which come from commentators or careless grammarians.

That the text used by Nonius in N. Africa in the fourth (?) century was at least a different bookseller's issue from its two contemporaries (?), the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*), which was a N. Italian codex, and the majuscule archetype (*P*) of the other MSS. (apparently a codex of Gaul), we may infer from the different order of the plays (see below, § 6). For Nonius' copy had this arrangement (some details are doubtful): 1 Amph., 2 Asin., 3 Aul., 4 Bacch., 5 Cist., 6 Cas., 7 Capt., 8 Curc., 9 Epid., 10-13 the M. plays (Mil. preceding Men.), 14 Pers., 15 Pseud., 16 Poen., 17 Rud., 18 Stich., 19 Trin., 20 Truc., 21 (?) Vid.¹

But the divergences of text which we are allowed to see are far too few to support any hypothesis that it belonged to a different (a third) recension. Of the first three plays in Nonius' text between two and three hundred lines have been preserved for us. The cases of real divergence between the 'Nonius' text and the *P*^A recension (or rather the *P*-text) in all this number are so few that they can almost be counted on the fingers of one hand. The most striking is Aul. 399:

Gongrum, murenam, exdorsua quantum potest (*exossata fa-*
sient P).

Unluckily, these three plays are not found in the fragmentary Palimpsest, so that we cannot demonstrate conclusively that the Nonius' text was actually descended from the *P*^A recension as opposed to the *A*^A recension. But it is certainly unlikely that the *A*^A recension would in so large a portion of text be identical with its rival.

In the remaining plays the more noticeable divergences are :

¹ See Rhein. Mus. LVII. 196.

Epid. 188 Iam ego me convortam in hirundinem atque eorum exorbebo sanguinem (*exsugebo* P, A n.l.).

Mil. 1180 (see above, p. 16). Nonius quotes *expapillato*.

Pseud. 864 (see below, § 6 (II)).

Trin. 252 vestispici (? *leg. -ca*) (*vestispica* A, *vestiplicae* P).

Trin. 839 Cum hisce aerumnis deluctavi (*Quibus aer*, AP).

If we consider how soon a variant entered by some owner in the margin would be transferred by a transcriber into the text, we shall see that no stress can be laid on so trifling a number of divergences. We may believe that the text of Nonius was practically identical with the text of the P^A recension.

§ 5. Other evidence.

Before taking up the actually extant texts of Plautus, it will be well to gather together the stray references in other authorities than the three we have treated, Varro, Verrius, and Nonius.

In the Republican period the first writer to be mentioned is Terence^m, who has borrowed two lines of Plautus :

(1) Eun. 801 faciam ut huius loci dieique meique semper memineris.

= Capt. 800 faciam ut huius diei locique meique semper meminerit (P, A n.l.).

(2) Phorm. 976 malum quod isti di deaeque omnes duint.

= Most. 655 malum quod isti di deaeque omnes duint (AP).

From Charisius and from Rufinus 'in metra Terentii' we get a few scraps from Sisenna's commentary on Plautus ; but whether this Sisenna was the historian (cf. Klotz *Grundzüge*, p. 562) or a grammarian of the Early Empire (cf. Froehde in *Philologus* Suppl. XVIII 596) is uncertain. Charisius used Sisenna in compiling his list of Adverbs, and expresslyⁿ ascribes the following information to Sisenna :

^m Those two imitations of Plautus are so early that they are worth quoting. But since there is no guarantee that imitations exactly reproduce the 'ipsa verba' of the original, I refrain from quoting those in Lucilius, Varro, &c.

ⁿ Notice that the mention of Sisenna's name is confined by Charisius to these quotations from the *Amphitruo*, the first of the plays. This implies, I think,

- Amph. 165 hoc luci] Quaecumque nomina e littera ablativo
 singulari terminantur, i littera finita adverbia fiunt, ut 'mani.'
 „ 313 illum tractim tangam] Pro lente.
 „ 554 tuatim] Ut 'nostratim.' Significat autem tuo more.
 „ 843 examussim est optima] Pro examinato. Amussis
 autem est tabula rubricata quae dimittitur examinandi operis
 gratia an rectum opus surgat.

The notes on Metre and Prosody that have been rescued for us from Sisenna's commentary are provokingly few. His remarks (if correctly given by Rufinus, VI 561 K.) on the O. Lat. genitive *malai* and the O. Lat. scansion *fūi*, *fūit* shew that his views on Plautine scansion were somewhat crude :

“Malai *διαίρεσις* metri causa.”

(ad Rud. 217 °) “Fuit extendit primam syllabam metri gratia.”

But the remark of his subsequently quoted by Rufinus is fairly true, for Plautus loves to present women's excited utterances in Cretic, Bacchiac, and other lyric metres :

ad Rud. I iv (? v) “Habiliore metro usus est, ut solet in mulierum oratione.”

His observation on Poen. 930 shews us that the Carthaginian passage (vv. 930 sqq.) was written as iambic Senarii, like its Latin version (vv. 950 sqq.), and that a metrical licence was taken with the scansion of the Carthaginian word for ‘gods’ :

“Alonim (halonium MSS.) Poeni dicunt deum et producenda syllaba metri gratia <sicut> exigit iambus.”

What he refers to in the other notes is uncertain^p, viz. :

that Sisenna is used, without express acknowledgment, in other Plautine references in Charisius' (Julius Romanus') list of Adverbs. Certainly the Plautus-citations of Charisius in this list shew a marked contrast to such careless citations by Grammarians as are discussed on p. 34 below. We have then some right to ascribe to Sisenna Charisius' remark about the spuriousness of Bacch. 545, ‘in quibusdam non ferunt’ (see below, p. 38), which occurs in this section dealing with Adverbs (s.v. *meditate*, p. 205 K.).

^o I take it that v. 217 and not v. 1105 is referred to. See Schoell in his Appendix, p. 149.

^p I fancy that the whole passage in the archetype of our MSS. of Rufinus has suffered from omissions caused by Homoeoteleuton, so that various citations have become attached to the wrong plays. The second extract may really

(on some scene in the *Aulularia*): *Haec scaena anapaesto metro est, sed concisa sunt, ut non intellegas.*

(on some line of the *Captivi*): *hic 'ornatu' (-tur, -tus) s litteram metri causa amisit.*

(on some line of the *Rudens*): *'latronem' producit metri causa.*

Evidently Sisenna did not understand that Plautine scansion represents the pronunciation of Latin at Plautus' time. In the time of Plautus *fui*, which had hitherto had a long *u*, was coming to be pronounced with a short *u*. That is, of course, the reason why Plautus scans, now *fūi*, now *fūi*. Sisenna looks upon the scansion *fūi* as a mere metrical licence, possible only in ancient times before exact rules of scansion had been imposed.

We find a similar misapprehension of Plautus' language by the author of the earliest Roman treatise on Rhetoric, generally known as the '*Rhetorica ad Herennium*.' The author (his name is unknown) wrote in the first part of the first century B.C. (see Marx in the Preface to the large Teubner edition).

Speaking of *Trin.* 23-26 :

Amicum castigare ob meritam noxiam
Immoenest facinus, verum in aetate utile
Et conducibile. Nam ego amicum hodie meum
Concastigabo pro commerita noxia,

he calls this a vitious syllogism, mistaking the Plautine use of *nam* 'for instance' for the causal sense of the Conjunction in his own time: (II 35) *Vitiosa ratio est quae ad expositionem non est accommodata vel propter infirmitatem vel propter vanitatem. Infirma ratio est quae non necessario ostendit ita esse quemadmodum expositum est; velut apud Plautum 'amicum castigare . . . et conducibile.'* *Haec expositio est; videamus quae ratio adferatur: 'nam ego amicum . . . noxia.'*

Cicero in his youthful work on Rhetoric has borrowed this passage (*de Invent.* I 95); *Si non ad id quod instituitur accommodabitur aliqua pars argumentationis, horum aliquo in vitio*

be: *hic* (i.e. 'in this line') *ornatus r litteram*, etc., the line being some such line as *pessusme ornatus eo*. The loss of *r* in a consonant-group in Early Latin scansion is a favourite topic of the Grammarians (cf. *Journ., Phil.* XXII 7).

reperietur . . . aut si ratio alicuius rei reddetur falsa . . . aut si infirma, ut Plautus 'amicum . . . noxia.'

That Cicero was a reader of Plautus (as of Terence) is clear from such quotations as :

Trin. 419 Ratio quidem hercle apparet, argentum οἷχεται. (in Pis. 61),

Aul. 178 Praesagibat <mi> animus frustra me ire cum exirem^a domo (de Div. I 65).

More are taken from the Trinummus than from any other play. There is no indication of his familiarity with any other than the 'Varronian' plays; and even of these only a few, we may guess, were seen on the stage during his lifetime.

Passing to Imperial times, we may recall Horace's allusions to Plautus as at least a proof that the old Dramatists had still a circle of readers and admirers. And we may infer the same from the contemptuous lines of Persius (I 77) :

Sunt quos Pacuviusque et verrucosa moretur
Antiope, aerumnis cor 'luctificabile' fulta.

and Martial (XI 90) :

Carmina nulla probas molli quae limite currunt,
Sed quae per salebras altaque saxa cadunt,
Et tibi Maeonio quoque carmine maius habetur
'Lucili columella hic situst Metrophanes,'
Attonitusque legis 'terrai frugiferai,'
Accius et quidquid Pacuviusque vomunt.

Quintilian had a somewhat better appreciation of the Early Dramatists, and recommends students of Rhetoric to read them (I viii. 8) : multum veteres etiam Latini conferunt, quamquam plerique plus ingenio quam arte valuerunt, imprimis copiam verborum, quorum in tragoediis gravitas, in comoediis elegantia inveniri potest. (cf. X i. 88—100).

But Seneca clearly regards them as fit study for the Grammarians of the time but for no one else :

^a Is this adaptation of the mood to the requirements of classical grammar the work of Cicero or of a scribe? Nonius (at least the archetype of our MSS. of Nonius) cites Epid. 138 with *cum mitterem* instead of *cum mittebam*.

(cf. de Ira III 37, 5; Epist. 108; and see Gellius' censure of him for his inappreciative attitude towards the writers of the Republic, Noct. Att. XII 2.)

The Grammatical works of the first century A.D. have unfortunately been lost to us, and the actual date of some Grammarians who are usually ascribed to this century, and of whose Plautine lore scraps have been preserved (Caper, Velius Longus, Caesellius 'Vindex'¹) is far from certain.

Pliny in his Natural History mentions a great controversy of the learned world over the genuineness of Aul. 400: "Artoptam Plautus appellat in fabula quam Aululariam scripsit, magna ob id concertatione eruditorum an is versus poetae sit illius." He quotes Plautus in evidence regarding 'murrina vina' (N.H. XIV 13, 92): lautissima apud priscos vina erant murrae odore condita, ut apparet in Plauti fabulis, quanquam in ea quae Persa inscribitur et calamum addi iubet, etc. (the reference is to Pers. 88: calamum inice). He goes on to mention a different theory based on other lines in Plautus by Fabius Dossenus. And he seems to have cited (with reference to Scaevola, Aelius Stilo, and Ateius Capito) Pseud. 740 in this form:

Quod si opus est ut dulce promat idem, ecquid habeat?
Rogas? (*Quid si opus sit . . . indidem ecquid habet AP*).

His nephew, the younger Pliny, speaking of a piece of good Latin diction says (Epist. I xvi. 6): Plautum vel Terentium metro solutum legi credidi.

In the next century Probus (of Berytus) is the outstanding figure. His editorial labours on the older Republican writers are well known², and although his works are lost, we have one or two

¹ I do not know whether we may believe on the authority of Caesellius Vindex that it was a stage-tradition for Pseudolus at Pseud. 235, to imitate the action of a trumpeter. Here is all the evidence (Charisius, p. 239 K.): 'bat' sonus ex ore cornicinis lituum eximentis, ut Caesellius Vindex libro B litterae scribit (without any allusion to Plautus' line). The word is also found in Epid. 95.

² Suetonius tells us how it was at Berytus that he acquired the taste for the neglected Republican literature (de Gramm. 24): legerat in provincia quosdam veteres libellos apud grammatistam, durante ibi antiquorum memoria necdum omnino abolita sicut Romae. Hos cum diligentius repeteret atque alios deinceps cognoscere cuperet, quamvis omnes contemni magisque opprobrio legentibus

anecdotes about his teaching related by Aulus Gellius in the *Noctes Atticae*. Thus at VI vii we learn that the poet Annianus told Gellius that Probus in his presence had read a passage of the *Cistellaria* with a peculiar accentuation of the word *adfati*m; at XIII xxi Gellius gives us on the authority of a friend of Probus that grammarian's pronouncement on the proper spelling of the Acc. Plur. *urbis* or *urbes* in this and that passage of Virgil and his appeal to an old copy of Georg. I corrected by Virgil's own hand; at IV vii Probus' letter to Marcellus is quoted regarding the Old Latin pronunciation *Hannibālis*, etc. Everything that we can learn of Probus gives us the impression of the extraordinary pains which he took to recover the 'ipsa verba' of the old writers even in minute details of orthography and pronunciation.

Gellius is the first of the Grammarians of the Empire whose works have been preserved. From his gossiping chapters we get some information about Plautus and an interesting glimpse at the careful treatment of the text of the ancient writers by the scholars and publishers of the time. A bookseller is willing to stake any sum on the accuracy of a text of Fabius Pictor's *Annales* in his shop (V iv. 2 grammaticus autem quispiam de nobilioribus, ab eniptore ad spectandos libros adhibitus, repperisse se unum in libro mendum dicebat; sed contra librarius in quodvis pignus vocabat si in una uspiam littera delictum esset). Old copies are hunted up in the libraries of Rome and elsewhere as evidence for the true diction and orthography of early authors. Thus a copy of Claudius Quadrigarius in the library of Tibur is found to have *facies* (Gen.) in the text (IX xiv); a 'liber verae vetustatis' (Livius Andronicus' *Odyssey*) in the library of Patrae witnesses to the spelling *insece* in the first line (XVIII ix. 5); a scholar shews Gellius a copy of the second book of the *Aeneid* 'mirandae vetustatis . . . quem ipsius Vergili fuisse credebatur' with the spelling *aena* corrected to *ahena* (II iii); Gellius goes in quest of a copy of a work of Aelius Stilo to the library in the temple of Pax (XVI vii); he finds the Dative of *dies* spelt *die* in an old copy of Sallust's *Jugurtha* (*summae fidei et reverendae vetustatis libro*, IX xiv. 26); an old text of Ennius' *Annals*, 'liber summae atque

quam gloriae et fructui esse animadverteret, nihilominus in proposito mansit; multaque exemplaria contracta emendare ac distinguere et adnotare curavit, soli huic nec ulli praeterea grammaticae parti deditus.

reverendae vetustatis,' said to have been corrected by Lampadio himself, is quoted for the true reading *quadrupes eques* against the corruption *quadrupes ecus* (XVIII v), and so on. Everything indicates that a microscopically accurate reproduction of the ancient authors was aimed at, and that anything like re-writing or over-bold editing would not be tolerated. The quotations from Plautus are not numerous enough to give us a clear picture of the text used by Gellius, nor is it always possible to determine whether Gellius is quoting from his own text or is reproducing a quotation as he found it in the pages of some grammatical authority. The spurious plays (of which he says in III iii. 11: *feruntur sub Plauti nomine circiter centum atque triginta*) are laid under contribution as well as the Vatronian.

The *Noctes Atticae* was one of the books used by Nonius in compiling his *Compendiosa Doctrina*, and some of Nonius' Plautus-citations come directly from Gellius and not from Plautus himself; e.g. Poen. 365, with attestation of *delicia* Sing., a form obscured by the scribes (probably independently of each other) of our two archetypes *A* and *P*.

The other Grammarians whose works remain are either contemporaries of Nonius or else one, two, or three centuries later, and do not add much to the fuller knowledge which Nonius gives us of the Plautus-text of the time.

Charisius is an important witness, for, as we have seen, he has preserved certainly a little (like Rufinus) and possibly a good deal of Sisenna's commentary. Of the commentary on the *Pseudolus* (and other plays?) by Terentius Scaurus, the famous scholar of Hadrian's time, one item has been preserved by Rufinus (VI 561 K.): 'nunciam': 'iam' divisit in duas syllabas metri causa^t. But as a rule these Grammarians of the later Empire are of use only as attesting word-forms or spellings which have so often been obscured in our extant MSS. through the fault of the scribes. Thus

^t Of course the truth is that Plautus regularly scanned *nunciam* (like *quoniam*) as a trisyllable, and perhaps did not recognize the scansion *nunc iam* (? Epid. 135). The confusion of *se* and *sese* and transposition are too common to allow us to refer with certainty to ignorance of this usage the *A*-reading in Poen. 746:

Suspendant omnes nunciam sese haruspices (*se P*),

or the *P*-reading in Mil. 357:

Age iam nunc insiste in dolos (*nunciam A*).

in Curc. 1 *ted* is attested by Charisius and Diomede; in Aul. 566 *pellucet* by Priscian; in Aul. 667 *Fide* (dative) by Charisius.

The warning given in § 4 against reliance on casual quotations of Plautus by Grammarians and commentators is strikingly exemplified by the quotations of Pseud. 178:

Nam nisi mihi penus annuus hodie convenit, cras populo
prostitutam vos.

(1) in Servius' commentary on Virgil (ad Aen. I 703):

Nisi mihi annuus penus datur,

(2) by Priscian V p. 170:

Nisi mihi annuus penus hic ab amatoribus congeratur, cras
populo prostitutam vos, o puellae,

(3) again by Priscian VI p. 260:

Nisi mihi annuus penus ab amatoribus congeretur;

and of Pseud. 1172:

An etiam ille umquam expugnavit carcerem, patriam tuam?

carelessly cited by Servius (ad. Aen. I 140) in this form:

Nisi forte carcerem aliquando effregistis vestram domum.

Most. 1103-4:

Sic tamen hinc consilium dedero: nimio plus sapio sedens
Tum consilia firmiora sunt de divinis locis

is quoted carelessly or rather paraphrased by Servius (ad Aen. IX 4):

Sine iuxta aram sedeam, et dabo meliora consilia.

It is, no doubt, necessary that such chance citations should be admitted to the critical apparatus of the larger editions of Plautus. And yet their presence cannot but be misleading, unless the reader is warned of their worthlessness. It is for the phantom brood of these citations in Nonius, Servius, &c., that a phantom parent has been imagined, the 'third recension.'

The Grammarians and commentators are most of them as liable as we found Nonius to misapprehend Plautus' meaning. Thus Servius misunderstands the word *tenuis* in Bacch. 793 (*ita intendi tenuis*), and explains it as '*extrema pars arcus*.' And they are

sometimes misled by corruptions in the text which they used. Priscian twice (i p. 97, p. 264 K.) attests *veteriorem* in Bacch. 1150, where Plautus clearly wrote *ulteriorem* :

Senem illum tibi dedo ulteriorem, lepide ut lenitum reddas.

Priscian's copy had VE- instead of VL-. Lactantius quotes Trin. 340 with *producit* instead of *prodit*. This corruption of the text, due to the substitution of a gloss for the actual word which it was written to explain, appears also in the 'Palatine' family of MSS., while the Ambrosian Palimpsest has the true reading (which is also attested by Servius) :

Nam et illud quod dat perdit et illi prodit vitam ad miseriam.

But the remarks on Metre and Colometry in the treatise of Priscian 'de Metris Terentii' are worth our attention, for the recent discoveries in Egypt are opening our eyes to the folly of disregarding even the less important of the ancient authorities on Metre. For example; in the first Canticum of the Amphitruo, where (owing to the want of the Ambrosian Palimpsest) we are quite at fault about the disposition of vv. 161-4, it is not wise to disregard Priscian's colometry :

Ita peregre adveniens
Hospitio publicitus accipiar.
(?) Haec eri immodestia coegit me,
Qui hoc noctis a portu
Ingratiis excitavit,

even though we can hardly accept his metrical account of the lines.

His Colometry at Truc. 120 agrees with the Palimpsest's :

Pessuma, mane.
' Optume, odio es.

§ 6. The Ambrosian and Palatine Archetypes.

We have seen the course taken by the text of Plautus in its history from the lifetime of the author down to the fourth or fifth century of the Empire. There were two main divergent channels, the one the direct tradition of the genuine 'ipsa verba' of Plautus, the other the transmission of that altered text served up by stage-managers to a later generation of spectators at the time of the

Plautine Revival. Further, the labour of Grammarians and Antiquarians on the text of the old dramatist, useful as it was in restoring the true ancient forms and phrases (for it is to them that we must ascribe the preservation of what we may call the 'genuine' text), often resulted in the creation of new variants. Thus the net result of their researches into fr. 100 (see above, p. 2) seems to have been the production of three rival readings, *scrupipedae*, *scauripedae*, *scripipedae* (?); and apparently in the same way in Mil. 1180, *exfaillato*, *expapillato* and *expalliolo*.

The conditions under which written, as opposed to printed, literature is offered to the public and transmitted by successive copyings would make it impossible for an edition of Plautus to preserve for any considerable time its original features intact. An edition which originally embodied, let us say, the direct tradition of the 'ipsa verba' of Plautus would sooner or later be contaminated with readings from the 'Revival' text. These would be entered in the margin, possibly by some owner, possibly by the bookseller, and in course of successive copyings might find their way from the margin into the text. The same thing would happen to such variants as had been proposed by this or that Grammarian or Commentator. However pure a text might be at the outset, it could not fail in course of time to become more or less what is called a 'mixed' text.

We could not, therefore, expect to find in one of our two archetypes an exact presentation of the 'genuine' text, and in the other an exact presentation of the 'Revival' text. That would be beyond the bounds of possibility. But we may hope to find (and I think we do find) that the one archetype has in the main conserved the one kind of text, while the other archetype retains a great part of the characteristics of the rival text. In examining the texts of our archetypes we must of course be careful to remove, as mere accidental accretions, the corrupt readings which are purely and solely due to the clerical errors of scribes, and which may have attached themselves to our extant MSS. at any period of the text's transmission. Some of them, no doubt, may be very ancient. We have seen that Priscian's copy of Plautus (at least, the copy from which he takes the quotation of this line) had in Bacch. 1150 VETERIOREM instead of VLTERIOREM, a mistake due to the common confusion of L with E. But a mistake like this, though it might disfigure the very earliest issue of

his or that edition, does not belong to the text as constituted by the editor.

Besides difference of text there is possible a difference of Colometry, *i.e.*, of the division of lines in the Cantica; also difference in point of the order of the plays and in other points of outward form, such as the Didascaliae, the Arguments, the scene-headings, the indication of the speakers throughout a scene, &c., &c.

I propose in this section to enumerate the divergences of the Ambrosian and Palatine recensions^u (to be styled A^A and P^A) in all these particulars, with the view of determining what kind of ancient editions they were, and above all of ascertaining which of the two has best preserved the 'ipsa verba' of Plautus. The enumeration will help us to decide some questions that have lately been mooted by scholars, such as (1) whether the two editions have all along followed two different channels or whether both come from one and the same source, namely some 'variorum' edition (cf. Seyffert *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 16, 252), (2) whether our tradition of the text has been unbroken from Republican times, or whether the furthest point that it can reach is an edition made in the early Empire.

I may as well indicate at the outset the result to which the following array of evidence seems to me to point. I think that the A^A-text is shewn to be mainly a representative of the genuine 'ipsa verba' of the plays, the P^A-text to hold in nucleus most of the 'Revival' adaptations, and that the two rivals (or at least the first) are possibly to be traced back in an unbroken line of tradition to Republican times.

(I.) *Lines inserted or omitted or substituted in the 'Revival' Text.*

Of all the varieties characteristic to rival recensions, insertions are the most likely to produce 'mixture' of text. For neither a bookseller nor an owner would be likely to resist the temptation of adding in the margin a passage found in another text, and so saving his copy from the reproach of being imperfect. As a rule we should expect to find the 'Revival' text characterized

^u So it will not be necessary to mention any mere orthographical or other minor peculiarities of A (the Ambrosian Palimpsest) and the other MSS. By ^v I indicate the archetype of these.

rather by curtailment of the 'Plautinae longae fabulae.' But here and there a manager would probably find that the audience required some lines to be inserted for explaining matters more clearly, or for stimulating the interest at a weak part of the play.

The following seem to me the more certain examples :

Asin. 23 sqq.:

Per Dium Fidium quaeris : iurato mihi
Video necesse esse eloqui, quidquid roges.
Ita me opstinate adgressu's ut non audeam
Profecto percontanti quin promam omnia (P, A n.l.).

Leo argues convincingly (see his note) that the second couplet was substituted for the first in the 'Revival' text.

Asin. 32 sqq.:

DEM. Quid istuc est ? aut ubi istuc est terrarum loci ?
LIB. Apud fustitudinas, ferricrepinas insulas,
Ubi vivos homines mortui incursant boves.
DEM. Modo pol percepi, Libane, quid istuc sit loci :
Ubi fit polenta, te fortasse dicere, etc.

All this passage down to v. 46 was apparently omitted in one text (undoubtedly the 'Revival' text), and for it was substituted this couplet, which appears in *P* (the evidence of *A* is wanting) after v. 47 :

DEM. Quid istuc est ? aut ubi istuc est ? nequeo noscere.

LIB. Ubi flent nequam homines qui polentam pinsitant.

Again (as in Asin. 23 sqq.) *P* combines the two versions.

Similarly in Bacch. 377-8 and 379-81 (P, A n.l.) and possibly 382 and 383 (P, A n.l.), and, I think, 392-3 and 394-404 (P, A n.l.).

Bacch. 540-551 *om.* A^a: *hab.* P^a. Charisius in his account of Plautine adverbs has occasion to quote a line (v. 545) of this passage, and mentions the fact of omission : 'in quibusdam * non

* Similarly the scholiast of Terence remarks (ad Andr. 601): et sane hi versus (vv. 602-9) desunt, quos multa exemplaria non habent. Wessner (in Berl. Phil. Woch. XXIII 222) shews that the passage contains an un-Terentian construction of *fungi*.

ferunt (-tur *edd.*).’ We have seen (p. 28) that he (or Julius Romanus, his source) got the statement probably from Sisenna.

Capt. 1016-1022 *om* A^A : *hab.* P^A :

TY. Quid tu ais? adduxtin illum huius captivom filium?

PH. Quin, inquam, intus hic est. TY. Fecisti edepol et recte et bene.

PH. Nunc tibi pater hic est : hic fur est tuos, qui parvom hinc te abstulit.

TY. At ego hunc grandis grandem natu ob furtum ad carnificem dabo.

PH. Meritus est. TY. Ergo edepol <merito> meritam mercedem dabo.

Sed dic, oro; pater meus tune es? HE. Ego sum, gnate mi.

TY. Nunc demum in memoriam redeo, quom mecum recogito.

Instead of this passage we find in A^A a single line (v. 1023), which appears also (at the end of the passage) in P :

TY. Nunc edepol demum in memoriam regredior, audisse me ;

and this line is certainly the ‘ipsa verba’ of Plautus. The scansion *regrediōr* proves it. So A^A has preserved the ‘genuine’ text, while P^A (or at least *P*) presents both versions.

Cist. 126 sqq. is a clear instance of an alternative version, omitted in the Palimpsest, having stood in the margin of the other recension. Here is the whole passage (the quasi-prologue spoken by the Lena) as it appears in *P* :

LE. Idem mihi magnae quod parti est vitium mulierum
Quae hunc quaestum facimus : quae ubi saburratae sumus,
Largiloquae extemplo sumus, plus loquimur quam sat est.

(123) Nam ego illanc olim, quae hinc flens abiit, parvolam
Puellam proiectam ex-angiportu sustuli.

Adulescens quidam hic est adprime nobilis

[Quin ego nunc quia sum onusta mea ex sententia

Quiaque adeo me complevi flore Liberi,

Magis libera uti lingua conlibitum est mihi,

Tacere nequeo misera quod tacito usus est.]

Sicyone, summo genere ; ei vivit pater.

Is amore misere hanc deperit mulierculam,
Quae hinc modo flens abiit. Contra amore eum haec
deperit.

Eam meae ego amicae dono huic meretrici dedi, etc.

The lines enclosed in brackets are omitted by *A*, and clearly stood in the margin of the other recension, for they have found their way into the text at the wrong place. They ought to precede v. 123. There is no cogent argument for or against their genuineness; but they certainly are quite in the Plautine manner^v, and if the play was twice acted in the poet's lifetime we may assign both versions to his pen.

Epid. 164-5. At the end of a Scene in trochaic Septenarii come two lines which in *A*^A are iambic Octonarii:

Ibo intro atque adulescenti dicam nostro erili filio
Ne hinc foras exambulet neve obviam veniat seni,

but in *P*^A are trochaic Septenarii like the rest of the Scene:

I, i, abi intro atque adulescenti dic iam erili filio
Ne hinc foras ambulet neve usquam obviam veniat seni.

The assimilation of the metre and the removal of the hiatus (*ne* | *hinc*) betray the 'Revival' text.

Merc 269 sq.

Verum hercle simia illa atque haedus mihi malum
Adportant atque eos esse quos dicam hau scio.

For these two lines of *A*^A there is a single line substituted in *P*^A:

Sed simia illa atque haedus timeo quid velint.

I suspect the last of being a stage-copy variety. There is a Plautine ring about the *A*^A version with its *eos esse quos dicam hau scio*.

^v The line preceding and the three lines following the passage in question interrupt the narrative. It has been suggested that, although found both in *A* and *P*, they are a Plautine insertion designed as a substitute for the second quasi-prologue, spoken by the god Auxilium, in which the story of the young Sicyonian is given. But I do not know that they are not in keeping with the rambling talk of the 'multiloqua et multibiba anus': 'I picked her out of the gutter—for all that there's a fine young gentleman head over ears in love with her)—and gave her to a friend of mine to bring up.'

Again at v. 276 we have two versions :

- (1) Ac metuo ne illaec simiae partis ferat (A^A),
- (2) Atque illius haec nunc simiae partis ferat (P^A).

Merc. 547

Breve iam relicuom vitae spatiumst : quin ego
Voluptate, vino et amore delectavero (A^A).

P^A offers for the first line :

Decurso spatio breve quod vitae relicuomst.

I would assign to Plautus the A^A -version with its loose grammatical structure.

Merc. 555 Nunc tamen interea ad med huc invisam domum.

This line is found both in A and P . But in P it is followed by a variant :

Interea tamen huc intro ad me invisam domum.

Can the variant be due to the avoidance of the archaism *med* ?
(See below, on Cas. 137.)

Mil. 997 ^a <Er>a mea cuius propter amorem cor nunc miser<a>e
co<ntremit>.

This line, omitted by P , is added in the top margin of A by the corrector (A^2). I see no cogent reason for believing A^2 to have drawn on any different (or additional) original than that used by the scribe (A^1) (see the Preface to Studemund's Apograph, p. xxviii). So I take it that this line stood in the margin of the original from which A was copied.

Most. 409 sqq. (Tranio's soliloquy pending the arrival of the house-key) :

Homini cui (? *leg.* qu) nulla in pectore est audacia—
Nam cuivis homini vel optumo vel pessimo
Quamvis desubito facile est facere nequiter.
Verum id videndum est, id viri doctist opus, etc.

After the third line the Palatine Archetype (A *n.l.*) offers v. 425 which recurs in its proper place. This looks like an indication

of an alternative shortening of the passage² by omission of vv. 412—424.

Most. 817—847. The possible omission of the whole passage and the substitution of these two lines :

Vin qui perductet? Apage istum perductorem; non placet.
Quidquid est errabo potius quam perductet quispiam,

were indicated in P^A recension or in some archetype of *P* by the adscription of the couplet in the margin at v. 817. Hence their intrusion into the text of *P* (*A n.l.*) at this point.

Most. 939 sqq.

Heus vos, pueri, quid istic agitis? quid istas aedis frangitis?
(940) Heus senex, quid tu percontare ad te quod nihil attinet?
Nihil ad me attinet? Nisi forte factu's praefectus novos,
Qui res alienas procures, quaeras, videas, audias.
Non sunt istae aedes ubi statis. Quid ais? an iam vendidit
Aedis Philolaches? aut quidem iste nos defrustratur senex.
(945) Vera dico; sed quid vobis est negoti hic? Eloquar:
Erus hic noster potat. Erus hic voster potat? Ita loquor.

Vv. 940-5 in this passage (which stands complete in A^A) were omitted in P^A, clearly a device of the 'Revival' text for the purpose of shortening the Scene. No subsequent owner in the series of tradition from P^A to *P* has in this case supplied the defect by a marginal entry.

Pers. 498. The bacchiac Heptameter :

Tabellas tene has pelligé. Haé quid ád mé? Immo ad te
attinent et tua refert,

is followed in A^A by this form of line :

Nam ex Persia sunt istaec adlatae mi a meo ero. Quando?
Hau dudum,

² The first three lines may be accepted if we suppose Tranio to break off abruptly at the end of the first line and re-cast the sentence, or if we change *cui* into *qui* (= *qui fit ut*). The common theory is that the second line comes from a parallel passage written in the margin of some early archetype. But suspicion attaches to the theory of adscript quotations. Editors have circulated it for far more than it is worth.

but in *P* by this form :

Nam e Persia ad me<d> adlatae modo sunt istae<c> a meo domino (? *leg.* ero). Quando? Hau dudum.

Since the next line is anapaestic :

Quid istae (-aec?) narrant? Percontare ex ipsis: ipsae tibi narrabunt,

we must, I think, refer the divergence to different metrical settings, probably due to rival commentators. In *A*^a the line is treated as anapaestic (like the following line), in *P*^a as a second bacchiac Heptameter. So the *A*^a editor (or rather the commentator whom he followed) scanned *tua* as a long monosyllable (less probably two short syllables); the *P*^a editor gave *tua* its usual iambic scansion, and made two words of *refert*^a, beginning the second line with *fert*.

Poen. 121 sqq. The prologue to the Poenulus had two alternative endings :

- (1) Is hodie huc veniet reperietque hic filias
Et hunc sui fratris filium, ut quidem didici ego.
Ego ibo, ornabor; vos aequo animo noscite.
- (2) Hic qui hodie veniet reperiet suas filias
Et hunc sui fratris filium. dehinc ceterum
Valete, adeste. ibo, alius nunc fieri volo:
Quod restat, restant alii qui faciant palam.
Valete atque adiuuate ut vos servet Salus.

The two are written continuously (in this order) in *P* (*A n.l.*). The second seems to me Plautine.

Poen. 706 sqq. A possible shortening of this prolix passage seems to have been indicated in the margin both of *A*^a and of *P*^a. Apparently the shortened version passed from v. 706 to v. 720, and thence directly to v. 730. At least this is what is suggested by the condition of the Ambrosian Palimpsest, in which vv. 720 and

^a Plautus' phrase (Capt. 296) *tua re feceris*, 'You will benefit yourself,' suggests that in Early Latin the Ablative (or rather Instrumental) of *res* was capable of the sense expressed at a later time with the help of the preposition *ex*. So that *refert* was two words to Plautus, like *magno opere*.

730 immediately follow v. 707, while in the Palatine MSS. v. 720 (without v. 730) immediately follows v. 706. The Ambrosian fragment unfortunately breaks off at v. 708, and does not resume till v. 746, but there is no reason to doubt that v. 720 and also v. 730 recurred in their proper place, as they do in the Palatine MSS. At its proper position v. 720 has in the Palatine MSS. this form :

LYC. Quin^b sequare me ergo. COLL. Abduc intro : addictum tenes ;

but at its previous occurrence it is unmetrical, both in them :

LYC. Quin sequare me intro. COLL. Duc me ergo intro : addictum tenes,

and also apparently in the Ambrosian :

(LYC.) Quin sequare me intro. (COLL.) Duc me ergo intro.

Poen. 930 sqq. The Carthaginian passage has a different form in A^A and in P^A. But in the latter the A^A-version was also present (in the margin apparently, to judge from its marred and curtailed form in our MSS).

Poen. 1042 sqq. In the margin of A^A there seems to have been indicated an alternative shortening of all this passage by the substitution of vv. 1042-3 for v. 1044, and the omission of vv. 1045—1052. Hence in the Palimpsest vv. 1042-3 follow v. 1048, and have appended to them v. 1053, which recurs in its proper place.

Poen. 1333-5 are omitted in A, which however appends to v. 1332 the opening words of v. 1333, a sign that the P^A-variant was added in the margin of A^A. It must, however, be allowed that there is a possibility of the omission being a scribal error due to the Homoeoarcton AGOR. These three lines are identical with three in the 'alter exitus' (see below), viz. vv. 1382-4.

Poen. fin. The Poenulus has two endings (1322—1371, 1372—fin.), both of which were exhibited by A and P. The second

^b The Plautine mannerism of beginning a remark and a rejoinder with the same word *quin* suggests that the shortened version of the passage may be the version of Plautus. For v. 706 begins with *quin* :

COLL. Quin hercle accipere tu non mavis quam ego dare.

begins (at v. 1372) without any indication in *A*, but the other MSS. leave a space as for the heading of a new Scene^c. Since Plautus as a rule has a trochaic ending for his plays (e.g. *Amph.*), the first version should possibly be ascribed to the 'Revival' text.

Pseud. 372. There were apparently two versions of this line :

- (1) Verum quamquam multa malaque dicta dixistis mihi,
- (2) Sed quamquam multa malaque in me dicta dixistis, tamen,

which have been 'mixed' both in *A* and in *P* :

Verum quamquam multa malaque in me dicta dixistis
tamen (*A*),

Sed quamquam multa malaque in me dicta dixistis mihi (*P*).

Pseud. 392. This line also (it is preceded by the words *tibi nunc dilectum para*) appears to have had two versions :

- (1) Ex multis ; ex illis paucis unum qui certust cedo,
- (2) Ex multis ; exquire ex illis unum qui certus siet (*P*^A ; but
P and our MSS. omit *ex*).

They have been 'mixed' in *A* :

Ex multis [atque] exquire ex illis paucis unum qui certust
cedo,

where the intrusive *atque* may be either a scribe's inadvertent addition or a wrong expansion of the symbol AL. (denoting a variant reading), unless, indeed, the construction *atque exquire illis* is genuine.

Pseud. 433. Here, too, is apparent trace of two versions :

- (1) Sed si sint (? sunt) ea vera, ut nunc mos est maxume,
- (2) Sed si ea vera sunt (? sint), quae tibi renuntiant,

which have been 'mixed' both in *A* and in *P* :

Sed si sint ea vera ut nunc mos est maxume tibi renuntiant
(*A*),

Sed si ea vera sunt ut nunc mos est maxume (*P*).

^c The Palimpsest fragment ceases with v. 1381, so that it is impossible to say whether it shared a peculiarity of the other MSS. which seems to indicate a possible shortening of the 'alter exitus fabulae.' In these v. 1377 recurs after v. 1381, apparently by way of indication that vv. 1378-81 might be dispensed with.

Some ten lines further on Callipho repeats his appeal :

Sintne illa necne sint quae tibi renuntiant,

and so some editors claim that this parallel passage was adscript in the original of *A* and produced the hypermetrical appendix *tibi renuntiant*. However, the theory of adscript citations, always a doubtful theory, is in this case definitely disproved by the fortunate retention by *P* of the first half of the alternative version.

Pseud. 523. In the Palatine MSS. (the Ambrosian is defective in this part) we have two equivalent lines :

Studeo hercle audire, nam ted ausculto lubens.

Agédum, nam satis libenter te ausculto loqui.

The second line is proved to be post-Plautine by Abraham (*Studia Plantina*, p. 182). Can the archaism *ted* have been its 'raison d'être' (cf. *Cas.* 137, below)? Or is it merely the freak of some stage-copy?

Stich. 48 sqq. At the close of the lyric passage with which the Stichus begins there are found in *P*^A, but not in *A*^A, ten lines of ordinary iambic metre, which contain a summary of what precedes. There can be little doubt that they were intended as a substitute, a dialogue passage instead of a version which required musical accompaniment. The simplification of the metre betrays the 'Revival' text.

Stich. 156 sq. have in *A*^A this form :

Neque quisquam melius referet matri gratiam

Quam ego meae matri réfero—invitissimus.

But there was another version of the second line, known to Charisius (? Julius Romanus), who attests the form *fami*.

Neque rettulit quam ego refero meae matri Fami.

And the presence of the two versions in some archetype has resulted in the banishment of v. 156 from our Palatine MSS., which present the couplet in this form :

Quam ego meae matri refero invitissimus.

Neque rettulit quam ego refero meae matri Fami.

The first version of the line, with its rude metre and (I think) hiatus 'in pausa,' appears to be the older.

Trin. 362-8. A possible omission of this passage is indicated by the occurrence in *AP* of v. 369 (in the Palatine MSS. followed by v. 368) immediately after v. 361, instead of at its proper place. The passage bears marks of old Latin (*nevolt*, *apiscatur* Passive), and may be ascribed to Plautus. The omission then was a feature of the 'Revival' text.

Trin. 788. The two versions are both incorporated in the text of *P* (*A n.l.*):

(1) Sed epistulas quando opsignatas adferet,

(2) Sed quom opsignatas attulerit epistulas.

The prosody of the second is abnormal.

Truc. 246 sqq. were in *A*^A trochaic Septenarij:

Velut hic est adolescens qui habitat (? *leg.* habet) hic agrestis
rusticus,

Nimis mortalis lepidus nimisque probus amator (*leg.* dator):
sed is clam patrem

Etiam hac nocte illa (-ac?) per hortum transiit^d ad nos. eum
volo

Convenire, sed est huic unus servos violentissimus.

The line-division of Cantica in our extant minuscule MSS. has of course no traditional authority, but their wording of the passage suggests two bacchiac Tetrameters preceded and followed by Iambic metre:

Velut hic agrestis est adolescens qui hic habet,

Nimis pol mortalis lepidus nimisque probus dator

Sed is clam patrem etiam hac nocte illac (-a?) per hortum

Transi[l]vit ad nos. eum volo convenire,

Sed est huic unus servos violentissimus.

The following four lines (which end this polymetric Scene) are iambic Septenarii. At vv. 224-7 there are also traces, not so clear as here, of a different metrical arrangement in *A*^A and *P*^A.

^d The dactyl in the first foot of the hemistich is quite regular.

The inventive faculties of students having been for some time directed to the discovery of alternative versions (*dittographiae*) in our traditional text, it will be readily understood that a huge number of supposed instances have been unearthed by their united labours. For the purposes of this enquiry it will be well to put in a second list such of these as have the best claims on our consideration, and to ignore the rest.

Asin. 480 sqq.:

In ius voco te. Non eo. Non is? memento. Memini.

Dabitur pol supplicium mihi de tergo vostro. Vae te!

Tibi quidem supplicium, carnufex, de nobis detur? (*? leg. datur?*) Atque etiam

Pro dictis uostris maledicis poenae penduntur mi hodie
(*P, A n.l.*).

Editors are agreed in regarding these lines as an insertion by some 'Revival' stage-manager. 'Ut a sententia, metro, sermone alienos damnat Ussingius' is the comment in the large Teubner edition. The 'plebeian' Latin construction *° vae te* (cf. Seneca *Apocoloc.* iv. 3: *vae me! puto, concacavi me*) can hardly be ascribed to Plautus.

Asin. V i opens in *P (A n.l.)* with two iambic Senarii (IV ii is composed in this metre), vv. 828-9:

Age, decumbamus sis, pater. Ut iusseris,

Mi gnate, ita fiet. Pueri, mensam apponite,

and proceeds in iambic Octonarii to the end of the Scene (v. 850). It has been suggested that these two Senarii are the substitute in the 'Revival' text for the longer version of the Scene. However we have other examples of a new Scene beginning with a few

° How far Plautus suits his language, his metre, and perhaps his prosody to his characters is a subject that would reward investigation. As a starting point might be taken remarks like those of Sacerdos (p. 433 K.) on Truc. 259: *quavis Plautus in Truculento posuerit 'non salveo,' sed inridenter; nam de persona rustica dixit, and of Priscian de Metris Terentii (p. 425 K.): Terentius trochaico mixto vel confuso cum iambico utitur in sermone personarum quibus maxime imperitior hic convenit, quem, puto, ut imitetur, hanc confusionem rythmorum facit* (with quotation of Ter. Andr. 481 sqq., Plaut. Truc. 95 sqq. and a passage of Turpilius). Cf. Tschernjaew 'de serm. Terentii,' 1900.

introductory lines in the metre of the previous Scene, before taking up a new metre of its own.

Asin. 894 sqq. In the 10th (?) century original of our minuscule MSS. which contain this play, there is a curious disarrangement of these lines. Between v. 898 and v. 900 stands v. 894; between v. 895 and v. 896 stands v. 899; after v. 906 we find v. 895 and v. 899 recurring in the margin. If all this goes back to ancient times, it may indicate at least one possible shortening of the Scene.

Aul. 592-8. The omission of these lines does not injure the sense and relieves the monologue of a certain amount of repetition. But the MSS. give us no clue. The Ambrosian Palimpsest does not contain this play.

Bacch. 65 sqq. In the Palatine MSS. (*A n.l.*) v. 73 occurs after v. 64 as well as at its proper place. It seems to me unlikely that the passage vv. 65-73 would be either omitted or composed by a stage-manager. The natural inference from the transposition is that in the Palatine archetype a page began with v. 65, and the top margin of the page contained a corrected version of v. 73.

Cas. 185 sqq. seem to me a case in point, although the fragmentary condition of the Palimpsest at this part obscures the truth. One version was, I think :

CL. *Pessumis me modis despiciatur domi.*

MY. *Hem, quid est? dic idem (nam pol hau satis meo
Corde accepi querellas tuas) opsecro.*

CL. *Vir me habet pessumis despiciatam modis*

Nec mihi ius meum optinendi optio est.

In the other text the first three lines were omitted. Unfortunately the fragment preserved by *A* breaks off after the third line. In *P* the first line is not found, but in its place stand the fourth and fifth; then follow the second and third, a transposition which I would ascribe to a marginal indication in the original edition that the first three lines might be omitted. The omission I would ascribe to the 'Revival' text, and would explain it as due to the obsolete construction of the accusative after the passive verb^f (*me*

^f In the Palimpsest the unmetrical insertion of *vir* before *pessumis* looks like a scribe's attempt to construe the sentence.

despicatur, 'contempt is shewn to me'; cf. Lat. Lang. ch. viii. § 63).

Bacch. 512-4 (spoken by Mnesilochus) :

Verum quam illa umquam de mea pecunia
Ramenta fiat plumea propensior
Mendicum malim mendicando vincere.

This form of the passage is found both in *A* and *P*. But in our minuscule MSS., towards the close (after v. 519) of Mnesilochus' tirade, we find a variant form :

Sed autem quam illa umquam meis opulentiis
Ramenta fiat gravior aut propensior
Mori me malim (? *leg.* Moriri malim med) excruciatum inopia.

The repetition (in slightly altered language) of his protestation would not be wholly out of keeping with the circumstances. But the theory of an alternative version (entered, we may suppose, in the bottom margin of *P* or of some archetype) is very probable. The exaggeration *ramenta plumea* sounds Plautine, while *gravior aut* is a weaker, but more strictly logical, substitute §.

Cist. 510-11, two lines in the conversation of Alcesimarchus with Melaenis, are omitted in *A*. It may be a mere error of a scribe. It may also be that they were substituted in the 'Revival' text for vv. 512—518 (or even for a longer passage preceding v. 519) with the view of shortening the Scene. The longer version seems to me characteristically Plautine.

Curc. 455 sqq. The ending of this Scene (*P*, *A n.l.*) is so awkwardly abrupt as to suggest that some Revival stage-manager cut it down to its present form.

Men. 360 stands between a Versus Reizianus and an anapaestic Dimeter.

The *A*^a recension seems to have offered an iambic line :

Nunc eum adibo atque ultro adloquar,

but the *P*^a recension an anapaestic Dimeter :

Nunc eum adibo, adloquar ultro,

§ Nonius' citation of the line offers apparently another attempt at amelioration, *plumbea* for *plumea*.

with a scansion *adloquǽr* which (unlike *adloquōr*) I suspect of being un-Plautine. At v. 364 also there seem to have been variant versions, but *A* is barely legible.

Men. 639^a is practically identical with v. 645 in *P* (*A n.l.*). This may indicate a possible shortening of this prolix dialogue by the omission of vv. 640-4, and the adscript verse may have ousted a verse of the text.

Men. 1028 sqq. This passage is very puzzling indeed. Certainty seems unattainable, and I will merely say in a few words what seems to me the most likely account. In *P* two versions of the line following v. 1040 stood in the text (1) *etiam . . . emisi manu* (the version found in *A*), (2) *vel ille . . . emisi manu*. Some later scribe accidentally omitted (through Homoeoteleuton) the second version, but a fortunate accident has preserved it for us. That accident was that the scribe of his original had omitted (also through Homoeoteleuton) vv. 1037—1043, which were then added by the 'corrector' in the top margin along with the following line (v. 1044). This last straggled over into the side margin and soon found a place between vv. 1036-7.

Merc. 619—624. This passage can be omitted without injury to the sense. But the same may be said of a good many passages in Plautus.

Mil. 1273. At the end of this line in *P* stand the words (found below at the end of v. 1278) :

iube domum ire.

Is this a mere accidental transposition or does it indicate a possible shortening of this prolix Scene by the omission of vv. 1272-8?

Mil. 1287-9 are omitted in *A*, perhaps by a mere accident.

Most. 93 sqq. run thus in *P* (*A n.l.*) :

Atque hoc haud videtur veri simile vobis,

At ego id faciam esse ita ut credatis.

Profecto esse ita ut praedico vera vincam.

Atque hoc vosmet ipsi, scio, proinde uti nunc
 Ego esse autumo, quando dicta audietis
 [Mea], haud aliter id dicatis.

Is this merely an instance of the prolixity, the 'non astrictus soccus' of Plautus? Or are the first three lines meant as a substitute for the last three?

Most. 1000 sqq.

Numquid processit ad forum | hodie novi ?
 Etiam. Quid tandem ? Vidi efferri mortuom. Hem !
 Novom unum : vidi mortuom efferri foras.
 Modo eum vixisse aiebant. Vae capiti tuo !

The third line is generally believed to be a substitute for the second. But it is not out of keeping with Simo's tantalizing evasiveness that he should repeat the remark to the impatient Tranio.

Pers. 666 sq.

DOR. Toxile, quid ego ? TOX. Di deaeque te agitant irati,
 scelus,
 Qui hanc non properes destinare. DOR. Habeto. TOX.
 Eu praedatu's probe.

After the last words *P* offers :

abi, argentum efer huc.

They may be an alternative ending, substituted with a view to shorten the Scene by the omission of vv. 668—72. But it is also possible that the eye of a scribe wandered (as in vv. 691-2) from this line to the following. The illegible state of *A* at this part does not enable us to decide whether a verse (ending in *abi argentum efer huc*) has actually been lost after v. 666.

Poen. 217 sqq.

Nam nos usque ab aurora ad hoc quod diei est,
 Postquam aurora inluxit numquam concessamus,
 Ex industria ambae numquam concessamus
 Lavari aut fricari aut tergeri aut ornari.

The first and third lines seem to offer an alternative couplet to the awkward second line, awkward because it does not contain

a single *bacchius*. Is the couplet a later improvement upon Plautus (or possibly a 'second thought' of the poet himself), or is the couplet Plautine, and the single line an unskilful piece of shortening by a 'Revival' stage-manager or (more likely) his faulty supplement of a lacuna in his stage-copy? Or has the scribe of some 'Palatine' archetype allowed his eye to wander from the true ending (now lost) of v. 2 to the ending of the following line? It is unfortunate that we have not the evidence of the Palimpsest to help us to a decision.

Poen. 300 sqq.

Invidia in me numquam innatast neque malitia, mea soror.
 Bono med esse ingenio ornatam quam auro multo mavolo :
 Aurum, id fortuna invenitur, natura ingenium bonum.
 [Bonam ego quam beatam me esse nimio dici mavolo.
 Meretricem pudorem gerere magis decet quam purpuram :]

(305) Magisque id meretricem, pudorem quam aurum gerere condecet.

Pulchrum ornatum turpes mores peius caeno conlinunt,
 Lepidi mores turpem ornatum facile factis comprobant.

Early Roman Dramatic poets liked to 'ring the changes' on an idea or a play on words in a way that is more in sympathy with 'Euphuistic' passages in Shakespeare than with the modern drama, so that we are in danger of suspecting interpolation where only the poet's verbosity is at fault. Still we can hardly avoid regarding some of these lines as alternative versions of others. I am inclined to regard the two which I have bracketed as a later improvement of the original passage. Both the Palimpsest and *P* contain all the lines, but v. 304 is put in the Palimpsest after and in *P* before v. 305, which suggests an intrusion from the margin of *A* into the text.

Poen. 390 Huius colustra, huius dulciculus caseus, mastigia

is omitted by the scribe of *A* but inserted (incompletely) by the corrector, who has written above *huius saviu* of the following line the words *dulciculus caseus*. This has been interpreted to mean that the corrector (*A*²) used a *P*^A-text; but there is no satisfactory evidence of *A*² having used any other text than the original of *A*¹. More probably the line was present (in imperfect form) on the margin of the original. Or again the original may

have had it in the text but in a miswritten shape (due to confusion with v. 391): *huius cor*, *huius studium*, *huius d. c. m.*, so that *A*¹ had some justification for omitting it. But the most natural supposition of all is that the line stood in correct form in the text of the original, that its omission is a mere clerical error (due to Homoearcton), and that the corrector did not shew proper care in making his correction.

Poen. 457^{a-b} are omitted in *A*. Their omission does not interfere with the sense of the passage.

Poen. III i. This Scene (for which the evidence of *A* is lacking until v. 572) seems to drag unreasonably. Leo cleverly suggests that a 'Revival' shortened substitute (vv. 543-6, 567-77) has been incorporated with the original Scene of Plautus.

Poen. IV ii. fin. The soliloquy or Milphio which ends this Scene runs in *AP* as follows (vv. 917 sqq.):

Illic hinc abiit, di immortales meum erum servatum volunt
Et hunc disperditum lenonem : tantum eum instat exiti.
Satine prius quam unumst iniectum telum, iam instat alterum?
Ibo intro haec ut meo ero memorem, nam huc si ante aedis
evocem,
Quae audivistis modo, nunc si eadem hic iterum iterem
inscitiast.

(922) Ero uni potius intus ero odio quam hic sim vobis omnibus.
Di immortales, quanta clades, quanta adventat calamitas
Hodie ad hunc lenonem ! sed ego nunc est quom me commoror.

Ita negotium institutumst, non datur cessatio ;
Nam et hoc docte consulendum quod modo concreditumst
Et illud autem inserviendumst consilium vernaculum.
Remora si sit, qui malam rem mihi det merito fecerit.
Nunc intro ibo : dum erus adveniat a foro, opperiar domi.

It is hardly conceivable that Milphio should repeat twice the same ideas in somewhat similar language. Besides, the change to iambic metre in v. 922 seems to mark the conclusion of a Scene. Therefore vv. 917-922 make one version, and the following lines another. In the first version Agorastocles is represented as being

in the house; in the second he is said to be in the forum. From vv. 805 sqq. we see that he was really in the house. The jingle in v. 922 *ero . . . ero* seems characteristically Plautine.

Stich. 161 sqq. The appearance in *A* of vv. 165-6 between vv. 160-1, instead of at their proper place, if not a mere accidental transposition, indicates an optional shortening of the parasite's garrulity by the omission of vv. 161-4.

Stich. 174 sqq.

Gelasimo nomen mi indidit parvo puer
(Propter pauperiem hoc adeo nomen repperi)
Quia inde iam a pausillo puero ridiculus fui,
Eo quia paupertas fecit ridiculus forem.

Editors prune the redundance of this passage, which exhibits the same form both in *A* and *P*, by assigning the second line to the 'Revival' text.

Stich. 208^a (in the famous Auction-scene) is omitted in *A*, its place being taken by vv. 232-3, which recur in their proper place. Was this an indication of the possibility of shortening the Scene by the omission of vv. 208^a—231? Or was it merely that the scribe of some archetype of *A*, having miswritten the two lines, entered them in correct form in the top margin of the page, with the result that the next transcriber substituted them for the top line?

Stich. 253-4 appears in *P* in this form :

Quid igitur me volt? Tritici modios decem
Rogare, opinor, te volt. Mene ut ab sese petam?

with an unmetrical second line. In *A* they are jumbled up :

Quid igitur me volt, mene ut ab sese petam
Tritici modios decem rogare opinor te volt.

Were there two versions of v. 254?

- (1) Rogare, opinor. Mene ut ab sese petam?
- (2) Rogare, opinor, te volt. Ut ab sese petam?

Stich. 483-5

Quando quidem tu ad me non vis promittere—
Sed—quoniam nil processi sat, ego hac ivero,
Apertiore magis via ; ita plane loquor.

Since the last two lines are not found in our Palatine MSS., the theory has been stated that the first line is the 'Revival' version of the two following. I see no reason for denying the omission to be a mere accident. The unconnected, repetitive style of the passage is exactly in keeping with the occasion ; for the parasite is desperately beating about for a chance of an invitation to dinner.

Stich. 688 may have had two settings :

- (1) Nam hinc quidem hodie polluctura praeter nos datur
nemini (A^A ut vid.),
- (2) Nam hinc quidem hodie praeter nos iactura dabitur ne-
mini,

for the Palatine MSS. offer (2) in a 'mixed' form :

Nam hinc quidem hodie pollectura praeter nos iactura
dabitur nemini.

But possibly the word *iactura* is due to some gloss or to some confusion of *polluctura* with *pol iactura* or the like.

Trin. 72 sqq.

Nam si in te aegrotant artes antiquae tuae,
Sin immutare vis ingenium moribus.
Aut si demutant mores ingenium tuom,
Neque eos antiquos servas ast captas novos,
Omnibus amicis morbum tu incuties gravem.

Editors suppose the second line to be an 'adscript parallel passage,' and the third and fourth to be an alternative version of the first.

Trin. 901 (in the long dialogue between Charmides and the Sycophant) :

Ubi ipse erat ? Bene rem gerebat. Ergo ubi ? In Seleucia.

The question is repeated in v. 928 (with a different answer):

Sed ipsa ubi est? Pol illum reliqui ad Rhadamantem in Cercopio.

Were it not that this is a long Scene, Plautus (or rather Char-mides) might be allowed to repeat himself unchallenged, and the inconsistency of the lying Sycophant would pass for a humorous touch. But editors seize the opportunity of discovering an indication of a 'Revival' curtailment of the Scene, and declare v. 901 to be a substitute for v. 928. The only curtailment, however, that could be indicated by this position of the two alternative versions would be the omission of the intervening lines, which, unfortunately for the theory, can hardly be dispensed with. On the other hand there is a third feature of the MSS. in this Scene that must be taken into consideration. They offer after v. 937 three lines which editors put after v. 888, supposing them to have been omitted in the text and entered in the margin of some archetype or other. This archetype must have contained more than the 20 (19, 21) lines indicated by various holes in the pages (see below, p. 79).

It will be noticed how prominently one or two plays (notably the Poenulus) figure in the above lists. Of course in the case of plays and portions of plays which have been lost from the extant Palimpsest fragment we have not the same facilities for detecting alternative versions, and that is partly the reason of the prominence of the Poenulus. But it stands to reason that the vicissitudes of each play must have been different. Some might never be re-staged at all. Others, found by 'Revival' managers to be popular favourites, would be brought out again and again. Some would be offered to the public with little^h or no alteration of their original setting, while a few (e.g. the Poenulus) might be greatly transformed.

(II.) *Phrases or words altered in the 'Revival' Text.*

The following seem to me the more certain examples:—

Bacch. 506 Ego faxo hau dicet nactam quem deluderet (A : *derideat* P).

^h So we need not have the uneasy feeling that, since the Poenulus-text contains so many 'dittographiae,' there must be a number of others, if we could only detect them, in the other plays too.

This loose construction is, I think, quite in keeping with Plautus' conversational style. The substitution of the more correct *derideat* I would ascribe to an editor or to a stage manager, who was possibly guided by a later line of the same play (v. 864): *Faxo se haud dicat nactam quem derideat.*

Bacch. 519 *Quam si ad sepulcrum mortuo narres logos* (A^A: *dicat iocum* P^A).

The 'ipsa verba' of Plautus are unmistakably preserved in A^A.

In the preceding line the exact nature of the divergence of *A* and of *P* respectively from what Plautus wrote is not clear.

Tum quom nihilo pluris mihi blandiri refert (*leg.-ret*) (*A*),
Tum quom mihi nihilo pluris blandiri referet (*P*).

Perhaps the change required is from *pluris* to *plure* scanned *blur*' (a monosyllable).

Cas. 137 *Sine vero amari te, meus festus dies* (A^A: *Sine a. tea amari* P^A).

The Palatine version undoubtedly improves the line. But if it were the original version, why should any stage-manager of the 'Revival' period think of altering it to the A^A-form? Can the archaism *ted* have been the cause? (cf. Pseud. 523 above).

Cas. 769 *Illaec autem armigerum ilico exornant duae* (A^A: *I. a. in cubiculo a. ornant d.* P).

The *P*-reading may be due to the mere substitution of a gloss *in cubiculo* for the O. Lat. *ilico* 'in (eo) loco.'

Cist. 84 *Opsecutast, gessit morem oranti morigerae mihi* (A^A: *O. de ea re, g. m. m. m.* P).

Again I suspect the intrusion of a gloss *de ea re*.

Cist. 132 *contra amore eum haec deperit* (A^A: *perdita est* P^A).

Editors print *deperit*. But the Palatine version is perhaps Plautine, the other being due either to a wish to remove the obsolete construction or to the intrusion of a gloss. (See, however, Berl. Phil. Woch. XVI 285.)

Epid. 515 There seem to have been two beginnings of this line (1) *propere sis*, (2) *propere igitur*. The latter is the P^A-version,

while the Ambrosian Palimpsest offers *propere sis igitur*, a 'mixture' that points to an original *propere igitur sis*. The use of *sis* in peremptory commands is Plautine (cf. infra ad Pers. 574).

Epid. 606 Si inuenio, exitiabilem ego faciam ut <illic> hic fiat dies (A^A: *illi f. hunc ut fiat diem* P^A).

The Palatine version seems Plautine; and on the other hand the Ambrosian in a similar case of discrepancy in Epid. 235 :

Haec vocabula auctiones subigunt ut faciant viros (*viri* P).

Possibly in one or both instances the divergence does not go back to the ancient recensions, but has arisen in the mere process of transcription.

Epid. 620 Sed quis haec est muliercula et ille ravistellus qui venit (A^A: *gravastellus* P^A).

The variants, as we have seen (p. 15), can be traced to the early commentators and gloss-writers.

Epid. 733 (the concluding line of the play) :

Plaudite et valet: lumbos porgite atque exsurgite (A^A: *surgite atque extollite* P^A).

Clearly the A^A-version is what Plautus wrote; the other is the adaptation in the 'Revival' text, with avoidance of the obsolete verb *porgo* (for *porrigo*).

Men. 572

Ut hoc utimur maxime more moro

Molesto atque multo (A: *molestoque multum* P).

The use of *multus* in the sense of 'tedious,' 'a bore,' is a feature of colloquial Latin, that cannot be said to have been obsolete at the time of the Plautine Revival (e.g. Catull. 112, 1: *Multus homo es*).

If the Ambrosian gives (as I fancy) the 'ipsa verba,' the other version, if not due to a mere scribal error (e.g. *molestoque multo*), must come from some later editor or corrector.

Men. 587 Aut ad populum aut in iure aut apud aedilem rest (A^A: *ad iudicem rest* P^A ut vid.).

The stricter laws of bacchiac metre require a pure bacchius in the last foot when the line ends in a monosyllable and are satisfied by *iudicem* but not by *aedilem*. But there are difficulties in the passage. The contracted form *rest* for *res est* (*res est* is the reading of all our MSS.) is not above suspicion. And is it certain that Plautus did not end with a Colon Reizianum (*aedilem rés est*) as he has done in the preceding line and in several lines in this Canticum?

Merc. 251 Ego enim lugere atque abductam illam aegre pati (A^A: *atque illam abductam conqueri* P^A).

The reason of the discrepancy is not obvious, unless it be the mere result of a transposition of *abductam* and *illam* in a stage-copy or elsewhere.

Merc. 256 Postquam id quod volui transegi, ibi ego conspikor Navem (A^A: *atque e.* P).

This use of *atque*, 'all at once,' 'of a sudden,' belongs to Old Latin (cf. Gell. X 29). Is *ibi* a gloss?

Merc. 271 Sed conticiscam, nam eccum it vicinus foras (A^A: *s.c. vicinum eccum exit foras* P^A).

The Palatine version is shewn by Niemeyer to have an un-Plautine construction of *eccum*.

Merc. 301 Sed ausimne ego tibi eloqui fideliter (A^A: *el. siquid velim* P^A).

Here too the reason is obscure. To me it looks as though some stage-manager had supplied for himself the missing ending of the line in some mutilated copy.

Merc. 314

Nam meo quidem animo plane decrepitus senex (A: *vetulus d.* P^A)

Tantidemst quasi sit signum pictum in pariete.

In Epid. 666 we have the phrase *vetulus decrepitus* (Satine illic homo ludibrio nos vetulos decrepitos duos Habet?) To me this furnishes an argument that Plautus used the same phrase here. Others use it as proof that the phrase here is an editor's invention or the result of an adscript parallel passage. Is *plane* a gloss on *tantidemst*?

Merc. 371-2 express the same idea as 389. Leo cleverly suggests that they were a substitute in the 'Revival' text for vv. 373—389. The evidence of *A* is wanting.

Merc. 767 Quid mihi molestus. Quia novisse me negas (*A*^α : *quia me non novisse ais* *P*^α).

The choice here is difficult.

Mil. 209 Ecce autem aedificat : columnam mento suffigit suo (*A*^α : *suffulsit* *P*).

Mil. 359 Credo ego istoc exemplo tibi esse pereundum extra portam (*A*^α).

The reading of the Palatine MSS. appears to be 'mixed' : *tibi esse eundum actutumst extra portam*, which points to an original like this :

eundum actutumst
tibi esse pereundum extra portam.

Plautus may have used *pereo* as a translation of *ἐπρω* in his Greek original, and the suprascript *eundum actutumst* may have been an early gloss.

Mil. 472 Quid iam? Quia hanc attingere ausus mulierem hinc ex proxumo (*A*^α : *hic in pr.* *P*).

The *A*^α reading is undoubtedly the older.

Mil. 1142 Ut lepide deruncinavit militem! At etiam *rogas*? *A*^α : *parum* *P*^α).

Editors usually give the preference to the *P*^α reading.

Mil. 1180 Id conexum in umero laevo, expalliolato brachio (*A*^α ut vid.: *exfaffillato* *P*^α).

The *P*^α reading is undoubtedly what Plautus wrote. The *A*^α reading is a grammarian's emendation.

Another of the kind, as we saw before (p. 16), was *expapillato*.

Pers. 597 Ne temere hanc te emisse dicas me impulsore aut inlice (*A*^α : *suasu atque impulsu meo* *P*^α).

Which is Plautus' version? If the play was twice performed in his lifetime, both may be his.

Poen. 342-3

Proba mers facile emptorem reperit, tam etsi in occulto sitast (A: *in abstruso* P).

Quid ais tu? quando illi apud me mecum palpas et lallas (A: *mec. caput et corpus copulas* P^A).

In the first line the *occulto* of A may be a gloss. In the second, if we may make the A-reading metrical by spelling *lallas*, it is far more suitable to the character of the speaker than the P-reading. The latter, perhaps, is also unmetrical. At any rate the excision of *mecum* would greatly improve the metre. (Cf. Berl. Phil. Woch. XVI 285.)

Poen. 1332 Bonum virum eccum video redeuntem domum (A^A: *se recipit d.* P^A).

Pseud. 85

Actum est de me hodie; sed potes tu mutuam (A^A: *actum*
- *hodie iam de me est sed potes nunc mu.* P)

Drachumam dare unam mihi?

It is conceivable that a miswriting *tum mu.* would lead to an emendation *nunc mu.*

Pseud. 223

Reprehendam ego cuncta hercle una opera, nisi quidem tu haec omnia (A^A: *qu. hodie tu omnia* P^A)

Facis efecta quae loquor (A^A: *facis scelestas haec ut loquor* P^A).

To my ear the assonance *herc-*, *haec*, *ec-* sounds Plautine.

Pseud. 298 Postilla omnes cautiores sunt ne credant alteri (A^A: *Ab alienis cau.* P^A).

The P^A-reading is clearly that of the 'Revival' text, avoiding the obsolete *postilla*.

Pseud. 315. Di meliora faxint (A^A: *di melius faciant* P^A).

Faciunt may be a gloss (cf. Corp. Gloss. Lat. IV 73, 30; V 295, 25) in Merc. 285, where P^A has *faxint*, while A has *facient* (leg. *-ant*); but not here, for the metre is consulted in the variant.

Pseud. 389. The line seems to have ended in two ways :

(1) *either adduc hominem celeriter, or propera hominem adduc celeriter,*

(2) *propera, adduc hominem cito,*

of which the second is the P^A version, while A shews 'mixture': *propera adduc hominem celeriter*. It is equally unlikely that *celeriter* is a mere scribe's error for *cito*, and that it is a gloss. *Cito* might more readily be a Late Latin gloss on *celeriter*, for neither *celer* nor the Adverb survived in Vulgar Latin.

Pseud. 397 Quoi neque paratumst quicquam certi consili (A : *parata gutta P*).

Alliteration favours the A -reading, but would still more favour a possible *ciccum*.

Pseud. 432 Fors fuat an istaec dicta sint mendacia (A^A : *forsitan ea tibi d. P^A*).

The P^A version is clearly that of the 'Revival' text, due to the avoidance of the obsolete *fors fuat an*. For it is designedly adapted to the metre and so cannot be a gloss. In Plautus' time *forsitan* was unknown.

Pseud. 669 Namque ipsa Opportunitas non potuit mi opportunius (A^A : *Nam ipsa mi Op. P^A*).

The metre is equally preserved in both versions, so that this is no mere accidental case of transposition by a scribe. The re-writing of the line must be ascribed to a 'Revival' stage-manager (or to an editor).

Pseud. 700 nimium est mortalis scitus (A : *graphicus P*).

Is the A -reading a gloss?

Pseud. 864

Si iste ibit, ito, stabit, astato simul ;

Si conquiniscet iste, conquiniscito.

This is the reading of A^A and, I think, of Plautus. But another version ends the second line, not with *conquiniscito*, but with *ceveto simul*, an ending awkwardly similar to the ending of the previous line. Nonius quotes this second version from his copy of Plautus. In some original of P the A^A reading had apparently

been written above *ceveo simul*, so that we find in *P* the 'mixed' reading :

Si conquiniscet iste, conquiniscito simul,
which makes the line unmetrical.

Pseud. 901 Eum promississe fortiter dixit sibi (A: *firmiter* P).

Is the *P*-reading a gloss?

Pseud. 997 Propera pellegere epistulam ergo. Id ago; tacitus sis modo (A^A: *ag. si taceas modo* P^A).

Pseud. 1175 Strenue mehercle ivisti. Quam velis pernix homost (A^A: *quamvis pernix hic est homo* P).

Can it be that the mere miswriting of *velis* as *veis* might lead to an editor's (or stage-manager's) re-casting the line in the form offered by *P*? Or was *quam velis* deliberately avoided?

Pseud. 1220 Magnis pedibus. Perdidisti, ut nominavisti pedes (A^A: *perd. postquam dixisti pedes*. P^A).

The P^A-reading is more alliterative.

Pseud. 1294 Di te ament, Pseudole. Hae! I in malam crucem (A: *Pseudole; pfui! <i>in m. c. P*).

Possibly the original difference was merely in the spelling of the interjection (1) *fae*, (2) *foe*¹.

Pseud. 1295 Cur ego adffictor? (-er)? Quid tu, malum, in os igitur mi ebrius inructas? (A^A: *mal. ergo in os mi* P^A).

Pseud. 1299:

Quae istaec audaciast te sic interdus

Cum corolla ebrium ingredi? Lubet (A: *incedere* P).

It is conceivable that *incedere* is a mere gloss. But the two variants present two perfectly legitimate varieties of the Cretic line.

¹ In Cas. 727 where the Palatine MSS. offer *ey ey* (for FY FY of their majuscule archetype), the Ambrosian shews something like *pol* (first and third letters doubtful) preceded by three indecipherable letters. Editors print *edepol*. Surely *foe foe* is much more likely. This Interjection *foe* has the same diphthong as the verb *foeteo* (not 'feteo'); cf. *foedus*, *foetidus*.

Ingrediri makes the line conform to the preceding line; *incedere* makes it of the same type as v. 1301 :

Suavis ructus mihi est : sic sine, Simo.

So the *P*-reading is quite likely to be the 'Revival' text substitute for the obsolete *ingrediri*.

Rud. 1126 had apparently two endings :

(1) sine me pro parti loqui,

(2) sine me pro re mea loqui.

For the Palatine MSS. offer a 'mixed' version : *sine me pro re mea parte loqui*. The Palimpsest fragments do not contain this part of the play.

Stich. 76

Utrum ego perplexim laccessam oratione ad hunc modum

Quasi numquam quicquam adeo adsimulem an quasi quid indauidiverim (A^A : *q. n. q. in eas simulem, quasi nihil ind. P^A*).

Eas in se meruisse culpam, an potius temptem leniter
An minaciter ?

One is tempted to ascribe the Tmesis *in eas simulem* (for *insimulem eas*) to Plautus, but the P^A-reading conflicts with the context. The miswriting *adeassimulem* might easily become *in eas simulem*.

Stich. 166 Sed matrem parere nequeo, nec quid agam scio (A^A : *neq. nescio quomodo P^A*).

The reason of alteration is not apparent. Probably some stage-manager, who had a mutilated or defective copy to work on, supplied the missing ending of this line by his own conjecture.

Stich. 237 Adibo ad hominem. Quis haecst quae mihi advorsum venit ? (A^A : *quis haec est quae advorsum it mihi P^A*).

If I am right in making *haecst* (cf. *hiest* Poen. 1333) the reading of A^A (the Palimpsest offers *haec est*), is it possible that this unfamiliar contraction was the reason for re-writing the line ?

Stich. 255 Immo ut a vobis mutuom nobis dares (A^A : *abs te<te> P^A*).

Stich. 262 *Malum quidem si vis* (A^A: *tibi di dent* P^A).

Or has there been an omission (through Homoeoarcton) of different parts of a couplet in the two MSS.? Or is *tibi di dent* a gloss?

Stich. 373 *Venit inquam. Tutin ipsus ipsum vidisti? Lubens* (A^A: *tun cum ipsum vidisti? Ita ego lubens* P^A).

The A^A-reading might be ascribed to avoidance of the hiatus *vidisti | ita*. The P^A-reading might have originated from conjectural emendation after the loss (by Haplography) of *ipsus*, just as two lines below the loss of *nimum* may have caused the divergence:

Argentī aurique advexit nimum. Nimis factum bene (A: *multum* P).

Of course the conjectural emendations to supply the gap may be the work of a 'Revival' stage-manager. But they might also be ascribed to a scribe (or editor) at any subsequent period. The unmetrical re-setting of Pseud. 307 (with *detque usque* for *det det usque*) clearly reveals the mediaeval or Late Latin scribe.

Stich. 390-1 *Vidistin virum sororis Pamphilum? Non. Non adest?* (A^A: *Pamphilippum. Non. Adest?* P).

The A^A-reading (with *Pamphilus*, a pet-name form of *Pamphilippus*) is certainly Plautine. The P-reading may have originated in consequence of the loss of one *non* by Haplography.

Immo venisse eum simitu aiebat ille: ego huc citus (A^A: *immo | aiebant venisse eum simul sed ego h. c.* P).

Praecucurri.

The substitution of *simul* for *simitu* may be the result of a gloss; and the order of the words in P may be a mere case of transposition by a scribe.

Stich. 586 *Valuistin bene? Sustentatumst sedulo. Edepol gaudeo* (A^A: *sustentavi* P).

Plautus certainly wrote *sustentatumst* (as in v. 467). Cf. below, Truc. 369.

Stich. 631 *Iamne abierunt? Gelasime vide, nunc consilio capto opust* (A^A: *iamne abiisti? G. v. quid es capturus consili* P^A).

Which is right? And what could be the motive for the change? Or are both Plautine?

Trin. 70 Nemost. Quid tu igitur rogitas tene obiurigem (A^A: *obiurgilem* P^A).

The A^A-reading is of course Plautine (cf. Ritschl Opusc. II p. 428). Nonius (190 M.) quotes (but not apparently from his own copy) Cist. frag. xii with *purgitans* instead of *purigans*.

Trin. 238^a Postulat se in plagas conicere: eos petit, eos sectatur (A: *eos cupit eos consecatur* P^A).

The *sectatur* of A may be a mere scribal error (or even a gloss) for *consecatur*. But it is possible that there is a difference of metre underlying the discrepancy. The A-reading perhaps exhibits an anapaestic Dimeter, which ends (as the iambic Dimeter in v. 236 seems to end) with a Colon Reizianum. The P^A-reading makes the line purely anapaestic.

Trin. 255 Haec ego quom cum animo meo reputo (A^A: *Quom ago cum meo an. et recolo* P^A).

The P^A-reading involves the total elision of *meo*.

Trin. 328 Bene volo <ego> illi facere nisi tu non vis. Nempe de tuo? (A: *ego il. fa. si tu non nevis* P).

The A-reading requires an impossible scansion (as a trochee) of *nempe*. But whether the A-reading should be ascribed to the A^A recension is doubtful. It may have arisen from the gloss^k *nonvis* for *nevis*. *Si tu non nonvis* may have become *si tu non vis* and ultimately *nisi tu non vis*.

Trin. 1064 Si bonus es, obnoxius sum; sin secus es, faciam ut (uti?) mones (A^A: *uti iubes* P^A).

It is noticeable how often these apparently causeless equivalent variants occur at the end of a line, the part which is liable to

^k The change of *nevis*, etc., to *nonvis*, etc., presumably the substitution of the suprascript gloss for the word explained (see below, VIII), is extremely common at all stages of the text tradition. Thus at Epid. 586 *nevult* (-ult) is retained by A and by B, but was changed to *nonvult* in the original of EVJ.

be lost either through a defect in the page or through the practice of writing the 'overflow' portion of a long line in the nearest available blank space. I suspect the agency of an editor who had a defective copy of Plautus to work upon, or rather of a stage-manager with a tattered stage-copy.

Truc. 197 Vise illam; atque opperimino: iam exhibit; nam lavabat (A^A: *atque opperire ibi iam* P^A).

The P^A-reading is that of the 'Revival' text, a substitute for the obsolete verbal form.

Truc. 238 Nosque esse avaras. quī sumus? quid est quod male agimus tandem? (A^A: *quī su. quī (? quae, ? quam) male nos agimus t.* P^A).

Truc. 245 Qui de thensauris integris demum oggerunt (A^A: *demus danunt* P^A).

The older phrase seems to be preserved in P^A.

Truc. 289-90:

Quia ad fores nostras unguentis uncta es ausa accedere

Quiaque bucculas tam belle purpurissatas habes (A^A: *quiaque istas buccas* P^A).

In the first line I think *P* had *uncta es audes accedere*, a 'mixture' of (1) *es ausa*, (2) *audes*.

Truc. 369 Benene ambulatumst (A^A: *ambulasti* P^A).

Cf. above, Stich. 586.

Truc. 374 Plus pollicere quam abs te posco aut (?hau) postulo (A^A: *quam ego abs te postulo* P^A).

The construction *ab aliquo poscere* seems to be unPlautine. The hiatus in the P^A version, *ego | abs*, is of doubtful legitimacy. Can the original line have been:

Plus polliceri quam te posco hau postulo (quam ego posco hau postulo)?

Truc. 375

Utinam item a principio rei pepercisses (? *leg. repersisses*)
meae (A: *ut. a pr. rei item parsisses m. P*).

Ut nunc repercis saviis.

Possibly a mere scribal error has been the cause of the discrepancy.

The following are more capable of being classed as mere scribal errors:

Bacch 496.

(1) Melius multo me quoque una si cum hoc reliqueris (A).

(2) Melius esset me quoque una si cum illo relinqueres (P).

The first seems the Plautine version with Hiatus *cum* | *hoc*.

Bacch. 948 Is Helenam avexit (A: *abduxit* P).

Cas. 636 Face ventum, amabo, pallio. Timeo hoc negoti quid siet (A^A: *negotium quid est* P).

The bracketed variant violates Plautus' laws of metre.

Cas. 747 Sed lepide nitideque volo, nil moror barbarico bliteo (A^A: *ritu* P).

Plautus certainly wrote *bliteo*.

Cas. 749 Gladium Casinam intus habere ait qui me atque te interimat (A^A: *invitat* P).

Of course *interimat* is the right reading.

Epid. 621 Hic est danista, haec illa est autem quam [ego] emi de praeda. Haecinest? (A: *quam emi ex pr.* P).

Were there two versions: (1) *quam emi de*, (2) *quam ego emi ex*? The Plautine phrase seems to be *emi de* (see Abraham 'Studia Plautina,' p. 201).

¹ The use of the symbol *al.* (i.e. alii, aliter, etc.) by a scribe or corrector is not always to be taken literally to imply that a 'varia lectio' was found in the original or was taken from another text. A mere blunder of a transcriber is often corrected in this fashion, e.g. Bacch. 344, where B has in the text an obvious miswriting, *id mihi aut utrum uerim*, but in the margin by the same hand *al. haud utrum uelim licere* (the true form of the sentence).

Epid. 624 Estne consimilis quasi cum signum pictum pulchre aspexeris (A^A: *videris* P).

It hardly seems as if a common word like *aspexeris* would require a gloss *videris*, or an editor would replace the one word by the other. I would rather ascribe the variety to a stage-copy's inaccuracy or the conjecture of an editor or stage-manager who had a defective line to restore.

Merc. 319 Humanum amarest atque id vi optingit deum.

This is the *A*-form of the line, but in *P* the second hemistich is: humanum autem ignoscere est.

It is possible that the passage was originally the same in both recensions, and that its form both in *A* and in *P* is due to omission through Homoeoteleuton and Homoeoarcton:

Humanum amarest, humanum autem ignoscere est,
Humanum <? ego patior> atque id vi optingit deum.

Merc. 475 Tuos amicus et sodalis et vicinus proxumus (A: *simul* v. P^A).

Is the *A*-reading due to a suprascript gloss?

Merc. 757 Scitam hercle opinor concubinam hanc! Quin abis (A: *non abis* P).

V. 754 ends with *non taces*? V. 779 ends with *quin abis*? Is either ending the cause of the discrepancy? Or is it due to a gloss *qui non* (for *quin*) so written, *quin*^{non}? The gloss *cur non* may have ousted *quin* both in *A* and in *P* at Pseud. 501 (see below, VIII):

Cum ea mussitabas. Scibo. Quin dictum est mihi? (*cur non d.* A P).

Merc. 765 Non, non te odisse aiebat, sed uxorem suam (A^A: *uxorem verum suam* P).

Is the *P*-reading due to the Haplography *non* for *non, non*?

Mil. 176 quis is homo est? (A^A)

The *P*-reading: *quis is erit homost*, seems to be a mixture of the *A*-reading and of a variant *quis is erit*?

Mil. 599 Unde inimicus ne quis nostri spolia capiat consili.

This line occurs both in *A* and *P*. But in the latter it is followed by a slightly different setting :

Unde inimicus nequis nostra spolia capiat auribus,

a decided deterioration, which must be referred to a 'Revival' text or an incorrect stage-copy, and not to Plautus himself. But it is conceivable that the mere presence of a gloss *auribus* may have originated the whole of this supposed rival version of the line.

Mil. 716 Nimis bona ratione nimiumque ad te et tuam vitam sapis (*A*: ut vid.: *vi. vides* *P*).

The actual reading of *A* is not *sapis* but *habes*. There is a possibility that this is what Plautus wrote, and that the *vides* of *P* is a gloss or a conjectural emendation.

Mil. 762 Were there two versions (the second written in the bottom margin, the other in the text of *P*)?

- (1) Sed procellunt se et procumbunt dimidiati dum appetunt,
- (2) Sed procumbunt (*leg.* procellunt sese) in mensam dimidiati <dum ap>petunt.

Or is not the whole divergence rather due to the intrusion of a gloss, *procumbunt* for *procellunt sese*?

Mil. III iii ends with the lines (vv. 945-6) :

Ut accurate et commode hoc quod agendumst exsequamur,
Ne quid, ubi miles venerit, titubetur. Tu morare.

Our MSS. (*A* n.l.) exhibit them in the reverse order. Is this a case of two variant Scene-endings or a mere case of transposition?

Most 605 Datur faenus mihi. Faenus illic, faenus hic (*A* : *date mihi faenus* *P*).

Most. 681 Videndumst primum utrum eae velint aut non velint (*A* : *velintne an non v.* *P*).

Most. 687

Eugae ! optume eccum aedium dominus foras
Simo progreditur intus (*A* : *ipsus* *P*).

Most. 714 Tempus nunc est senem hunc adloqui mihi seems to have stood in the margin of some archetype of *A* in this form :

Tempus nunc est mihi hunc adloqui senem.

Most. 761

Nam sibi laudavisse hasce ait architectonem

Nescioquem exaedicatas insanum bene (*A*^A : *ex. has sane bene P*?).

Our existing Palatine MSS. have *has sane* instead of the Plautine *insanum*, but whether their archetype *P* had not *INSANE* which was misread as *IASANE* and emended to *has sane* it is impossible to say.

Most. 928 faciam ut iubes (*A* : *voles P*).

The miswriting of *iubes* as *iules* would lead to the substitution of *voles*. Or any scribe might in a moment of absent-mindedness write the one word instead of the other.

Pers. 20 Mihi quidem tu iam eras mortuos, quia non te visitabam (*A* : *visitavi P*).

Pers. 171 Me quidem iam satis tibi spectatam censebam esse et meos mores (*A* : *censueram P*).

Pers. 178

Amas pol misera : id tuos scatit animus.

Ego istuc pelagus tibi ut sit faciam (*A* : *placidum P*).

Is the substitution due to a gloss? And which is the Plautine word?

Pers. 269 Verberibus caedi iusserit, compedis impingi? vapulet! (*A*^A : *imponi P*).

Plautus certainly wrote *impingi*, but the other may be a mere scribe's error, and not the reading of the *P*^A recension. In Nonius' *Compendiosa Doctrina* we find a citation of Trin. 720, which Nonius took from some Grammarian or Commentator, and not from his own copy of Plautus. It shews *supponi* instead of *suppingi*.

Pers. 321 Sequere hac sis: argentum hic inest, quod mecum dudum orasti (A^A: *quod me dudum rogasti* P).

I suspect the agency of a gloss. *Rogo* is the stock-gloss on *oro* in dictionaries of the Empire.

Pers. 436

Ubi quid credideris citius extemplo a foro

Fugiant quam ex porta ludis emissus lepus (A: *cum emissus* l. P).

Pers. 515-6 *lucrifer...lucrifer* (A: *lucrifica...lucrifica* P).

Pers. 574 I sis [in] malum cruciatum. I sane tu—hanc eme, ausculta mihi (A: *sis* et *tu* om. P) (cf. supra ad. Epid. 515).

Pers. 709 animus <iam> in navist mihi (A^A: *meus* P).

Cf. below, Pseud. 637.

Poen. 163 sq.

Iocare. Vin tu illam hodie sine damno et dispendio

Tuo tuam libertam facere? Cupio, Milphio.

Does this unmetrical setting of v. 163 in *P* (A *n.l.*) point to an older: *sine dispendio* | *Tuo tuam* and a later (with avoidance of the proceleusmatic): *sine damno tuo* | *Tuam*?

Poen. 648 Canes compellunt in plagas lepide lupum (A: *lycum* [? *λύκαν*, ? *Lycum*] P).

The *P*-reading is probably a gloss explaining the allusion.

Poen. 1249 Quid si eloquamur? Censeo hercle, patruē. Misera timeo (A^A: *Quin eloquar* [leg. -quamur] P).

Poen. 1252 Ne indigna indignis di darent, id ego evenisset vellem (A: *evenire* P).

Pseud. 91 Quis mi igitur drachumam reddet, si dederō tibi? (A: *dederim* P).

Plautus may have written *dederim* (but cf. below, Pseud. 376).

But whether the intrusive *solus* in the line as offered by the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*inv. solus ve.*) points to a variant *solus* (in place of *vero*) or is a mere scribal error is uncertain.

Pseud. 637 id est nomen meum (A : *mihi* P).

Cf. above, Pers. 709.

Pseud. 657 Scin quid te oro ? (A^A : *orem* P).

Pseud. 713 Si quid opus est (A : *quicquid o. e.* P).

Pseud. 718 et quinque argenti minas (A : *cum q. a. minis* P).

Pseud. 723 Egone ? Tu istic ipse, inquam (A^A : *tute ergo ip.* P^A).
Conceivably a gloss.

Pseud. 889 The A^A recension had :

Molestus ne sis. nimium iam tinnis. tace.

If there was another version : *nimum tinnis. non taces ?*
then we can explain the unmetrical *P*-reading as 'mixed' :

nimum iam tinnis. non taces ?

We might explain the other version as a conjectural emendation (by an editor or stage-manager) of a defective copy in which *iam* had dropped out after *nimum*. But there is also this possibility to be reckoned with, that both *A* and *P* are guilty of aberration from this original ending of the line :

nimum iam tinnis. taces ?

Rud. 577 ubi fluit (A : *si pl.* P).

Rud. 787 non hercle equidem censeo (A : *egomet* P).

Stich. 94 PAN. Mane pulvinum. ANT. Bene procuras mihi satis sic fultumst. PAMPH. Sede (A : *m. sa. sic f. mihi* P).

Stich. 140 Hostis est uxor, invita quae viro nuptum datur (A^A : *ad virum* P^A). The P^A construction may be Plautine (e.g. Epid. 38).

Stich. 371 Interibi Epignomum conspicio tuum virum et servum Stichum (A^A : *interim* P).

Cf. above, Pseud. 573^a.

Stich. 451 Ibo opsonatum atque eadem referam opsonium (A : *ea ibo opsonatum, eadem ref. ops.* P^A).

The presence of *atque* in *A* may be due to a common scribal error.

Trin. 61 Namque enim tu, credo, me imprudentem obrepseris (*A*^A: *mihi imprudenti* P).

Trin. 88 Sed istuc negoti cupio scire quid siet (*A*: *scire cupio quicquid est* P).

Was the archaism *siet* the cause of the change? See Leo's note on the line and cf. Seyffert in Berl. Phil. Woch. XVI, 285.

Trin. 186 Were there two versions of the line?

(1) Hasc' mihi propter res maledicas famas ferunt (*malas* A),

(2) Hascine mi propter res malas famas ferunt? (*P*^A).

And is the *malas* of *A* due to a marginal variant or interlinear gloss?

Trin. 214 Bonis qui hunc adulescentem evortisset omnibus (*A*: *ev. suis* P.)

To my ear *bonis qui . . suis* gives the truer Plautine rhythm.

Trin. 251 Vestispica, unctor, auri custos, flabelliferae, sandaligerulae (*A*: *vestiplicae* P).

Vesti(s)pica (cf. Nonius 12 M.) is Plautine, *vestiplica* late. (See Leo in *Mélanges Boissier*).

Trin. 335 *praemandatum* A: *praedicatum* P.

Is *praedicatum* a gloss?

Trin. 448-9

Neque te derisum advenio neque dignum puto. (*A*^A: *veni* P).

Verum hoc quod dixi (*A*^A; *ut d.* P).

Trin. 452 Cum vestra nostra non est aequa factio (*A*: *vestris* P).

Trin. 456 ferentarium (*A*^A: *ferentaneum* P).

The *A*^A-reading is confirmed by Varro. Was the other a plebeian form? (cf. above, p. 48 *Subitarius* became in Later Lat. *subitanus* (cf. French 'soudain' from Vulg. Lat. *subitanus*).

Trin. 537 Were there two endings of this line?

(1) apage istunc agrum,

(2) apage a me istum agrum.

Trin. 560 Lepide hercle agro ego hoc hunc senem deterrui (A : *l. h. de agro ego hunc s. d. P*).

Trin. 743 Incolumem sistere illi (A : *columem te s. i. P*).

The P^A-reading seems Plautine.

Trin. 747 Eadem omnia istaec veniunt in mentem mihi (A : *Nam hercle o. P*).

Is *eadem* a gloss?

Trin. 839 dehinc iam certumst otio dare me (A^A : *deinde hinc ce. P*).

The P^A-reading may be due to a mere suprascript correction of *deinde* (presumably a scribal error) into *dehinc*.

Truc. 73

(?) (1) Neque equidem id factura neque tu ut facias consilium dabo (A^A),

(?) (2) Neque ego factura id sum neque, etc (P^A).

Truc. 189 *spero* (A) : *credo* (P).

Truc. 202 Tum pol istic est puero pater Babyloniensis miles (A^A : *isti puero quidemst pa. P*).

Truc. 259 Salve. Sat mi est tuae salutis : nil moror : sat salveo (A : *non salveo P*).

If *non* be, as some think, a conjectural stop-gap after the loss of *sat* (before *sal-*), then the conjecture is of early date. For the grammarian Marius Plotius Sacerdos twice quotes the line with this version, *non salveo*. On the other hand *sat* may have been a miswriting (left uncorrected) of the first syllable of *salveo* and may have ousted *non* from its place.

Truc. 281 Sed quid ad nostras negoti, mulier, est aedis tibi? (A : *apud P*).

A gloss?

Truc. 304-5 :

Quid maceria illa ait in horto quae est, quae in noctes singulas
Latere fit minor qua is aput vos damni permensust viam? (A :
qua† isti† P).

Nil mirum—vetus est maceria—lateres si veteres ruont (A : *non*
m. P).

The MSS. of Priscian offer *quam is hoc ad vos*. Editors print
qua isto ad vos or *qua istoc ad vos*.

Truc. 378 DIN. Iam lauta es? PHRON. Lautam mihi quidem
atque oculis meis (A : *es?* PHRON. *Iam pol m.* P^A).

Is *iam pol* a stop-gap after the loss of the repeated *lautam*? Or
is the repeated word a gloss?

Truc. 381 Cum inter nos sordebamus alter de altero (A^A : *alter*
alteri P^A).

(For other examples, especially of 'mixed' readings, see Seyffert
in Berl. Phil. Woch. XVI 284 sqq.)

We have already had instances of a Grammarian's citation agreeing
with A^A against P^A.

In the greater portion of Plautus' writings the evidence of A
is unprocurable. It will then be well to supplement this list by
a few typical cases of such divergent citations by Grammarians
as seem to have some claim to be regarded as the A^A versions :

Curc. 424 Clupeatus elephantum ubi machaera dissicit (*diligit*
Gramm.).

Men. 854 Barbatum, tremulum Titanum Cycno prognatum patre
(*qui cluet Cygno patre* Gramm.).

Pers. 463 Tiara ornatum lepide condecorat tuum (*lepida con-*
decorat schema Gramm.).

(III.) *External Form of the two Editions, Colometry, Order of Plays, etc.*

The form of the A^A text we infer from the form of the ancient
copy that has survived in a fragmentary and often illegible state to

our own time, the Ambrosian Palimpsest written in Rustic Capital script of the 3rd or 4th century. To reconstruct the form of that ancient copy of the P^A edition which was the archetype at once of our existing minuscule MSS. (BCDEVJO) and of the lost minuscule codex Turnebi (T) is not easy, but the recent discovery of a collation of parts (Bacch. 35-80, 570-650, 810-900, Pers., Poen., Pseud. 730-fin., Rud. 1-790) of T has greatly facilitated the problem. We may believe it to have been a codex of the same script and therefore of about the same age as A. While A has 19 lines to the page, it appears^m to have had 19 in some plays, 20 in others, 21 in others. But the number of lines assigned to a page is a trifling matter. More important is the form in which the lines appeared. The Palatine archetype seems to have followed the same method as the Palimpsest for distinguishing lines of different metre, the Alexandrianⁿ method of Colometry, by which the longest lines begin at the extreme left-hand of the page (ἐν ἐκθέσει), the shortest nearer the middle of the page (ἐν εἰσθέσει). Whether these curious opening κωλάρια, which seem in the Palimpsest to indicate a metrical 'system' or run, were also a feature of the Palatine archetype we cannot say^o, e.g. Epid. 9 sqq. :

^m Since the number of lines in the Palatine archetype is inferred from the gaps resulting from holes in leaves, there is always a possibility that all these flaws may not really have belonged to one and the same MS. Some gaps may go back to the original from which the archetype was itself copied, others to the parent of that original and so on. The anticipation of Pseud. 1205-7 (which recur in their proper place) after 1161 in T as well as in the minuscule archetype points to a page of 21 lines in that original of which the majuscule archetype was a copy. Another thing to be borne in mind in this connexion is that a copy often retained on its pages the exact number of lines of its original, so that the displacement of the Mostellaria leaves and the lacunae at vv. 784, 802 may belong to different MSS. (See also p. 57 above.)

ⁿ From discoveries in Egypt and elsewhere we learn the ancient practice of writing lyric passages continuously without breaking them up into lines. Prof. Leo, who can speak with more authority than almost any other person on the subject, ascribes the colometrical arrangement of Plautus' Cantica to the time of Accius.

^o But we may safely make a feature of both recensions the irregular distribution of lines in Synaphea, e.g. Capt. 524-5 *omnis | res* for *om- | -nis res*, Epid. 173-4 *credidi | uxorem* for *credidi ux- | -orem* (cf. Amph. 1067-8). It is on the same principle, I fancy, that Men. 200 *subcingulum haud | Hercules aequo magno unquam abstulit periculo*, appears in AP as *subcingulum | haud Hercules, &c.*

QVID

TV AGIS VT VALES

EXEMPLVM ADESSE INTELLEGO EVGAE

Unfortunately the original line-division in our extant minuscule MSS. has been so much abandoned in Song-Cantica for the sake of saving space that we hardly dare to reconstruct it from the line-division that now appears in these MSS. But in this matter too the newly discovered collation of *T* is most helpful. Discrepancy in the line-division of the two rival recensions can scarcely be looked for outside of the Song-Cantica, for the ordinary Iambic and Trochaic metres do not admit of variety in analysis. So that our field for comparison of *A*^A and *P*^A in this respect is narrowed to the half-dozen-Song-Cantica (or rather portions of them) for which the evidence at once of *T* and of *A* is available. Even within these narrow limits we find sufficient trace of discrepancy to enable us to infer, by induction from 'the known to the unknown,' that the two recensions differed in this feature too, a difference which can hardly (like mere difference of text) be referred to marginal variants. We cannot suppose that an alternative scheme of a Canticum was exhibited in the margin of this or that recension in such a form that a subsequent copyist was likely to embody in his transcript the marginal arrangement instead of the arrangement actually exhibited in the text.

Pseud. 1329-30 appear ^P in *A*^A as a long bacchiac series :

Quid nunc? numquid iratus es aut mihi aut filio pro-
-pter has res, Simo? Nil profecto.

I hác : te sequor. Quin vocas spectatores simúl? Her-
-cle me isti hau solent, etc.

Whether *vocare . . . istos* was in *A*^A bacchiac (a second paeon with a bacchius or a bacchius with a fourth paeon) or iambic (with *ergo*) is not quite clear.

In *P*^A a bacchiac Trimeter Catalectic was followed by a long cretic series :

^P It is true that in *A* (in which the practice is to begin a new play on a new leaf) the play ends on this page, the second page of the leaf, so that the scribe might be tempted to combine short lines into long for the sake of saving space. But he can hardly have hit upon a legitimate alternative metrical arrangement by mere accident, and of course he cannot be credited with any knowledge of bacchiac metre.

Quid nunc? numquid iratus es
Aut mihi aut filio propter has res, Simo?
Nil profectô. I hác: te sequor. Quin vocas
Spectatores simul? Hercle me isti hau solent.

Pseud. 1315 sqq. The anapaestic run or 'system' was in A^A written in Tetrameters, but in P^A in Dimeters.

Similarly perhaps at Pseud. 908, 939, more certainly at 1320-1 and 1131.

Undoubtedly in some Cantica (e.g. Trin. II i) for which we have not the evidence of *T*, we are almost entitled to infer from their appearance^a in the Codex Vetus (*B*) that a different arrangement prevailed in P^A from that followed in A^A. But the evidence even of the Codex Vetus in point of Colometry is notoriously unsafe; so I prefer, in the absence of *T*, to ignore all metrical discrepancies except such as are unmistakably^r indicated by an alteration of the language, e.g., Epid. 164-5 (in A^A iambic Octonarii, in P^A trochaic Septenarii). These have been already enumerated in Part I of this section and need not be repeated here. But the strong argument should not be forgotten which they furnish for the independence of the two recensions. They almost suffice of themselves to confute the commonly accepted theory that P^A and A^A are both derived from one and the same 'variorum' edition.

An interesting question is how far stage-directions were present in the two recensions. In the Palimpsest there is now no trace of any, though it is of course conceivable that they were originally written in red pigment and were washed out when the vellum came to be prepared for re-writing in the 7th or 8th century. In our extant Palatine MSS. there are one or two, but it is not easy to say whether they are relics of the P^A recension, or interpolations by some mediaeval scribe.

At Aul. 60, for example, where the dialogue between Euclio and Staphyla ceases, and Euclio, after a remark to Staphyla, goes on in a monologue, his monologue had in the archetype (at

^a The opening lines of Men. II iii are quite illegible in *A*. But the colometry of *B* at least for v. 352 *Intus . . . fiat* seems to have agreed with that of Varro, who quotes this line (see p. 9 above).

^r Most of Baier's instances of editorial re-casting of lines in dialogue-metres seem to me so uncertain that I do not venture to use them for purposes of argument. See above, for example, on Trin. 328 (p. 67).

least in the original of our extant MSS.) the heading ^s *hoc secum loquitur*. The Menander fragments recently discovered in Egypt have stage-directions here and there; e.g., in the *Περικειρομένη* fragment we find in the margin *ἐξέρχεται Δωρίς*, between the lines *Πολέμων εἴσσεισι*, etc. And in the P^A family of MSS. we have clear traces of the use of the Greek word *πάντες* at the end of the play when all the actors stepped forward 'to the footlights' and asked for the applause of the audience (see below, p. 83).

Of the 'notae criticae' used by Alexandrian editors and their Roman imitators ^t we find only this doubtful trace in our extant MSS. Varro (Serm. Lat. iv 74 W.) mentions a 'nota transversa' (apparently like our symbol for hiatus) used to indicate 'syllaba anceps' (and hiatus?) at the end of a line (or hemistich? and in pausa?), as in Terence's line:

amicus summus meus et popularis Getā | .

It is possible that traces of this symbol survive in our MSS. of Plautus. Schoell in his introduction to the *Truculentus* (p. xxxiv) refers to this origin a curious habit of the Palatine scribes of appending either the letter *t* or *i* or *l* (originally this 'nota transversa') to words ending a short colon (e.g. v. 120 *mane*[*l*]; 123 *tu*[*l*], which has become *tuli*) or the remarks of one speaker where there is a change of speakers within the line (e.g. 152 *probe*[*i*] *Em*, which has caused *Idem* to be written for *Em*; 203 *expetit*[*i*]), and the instances which he cites do give some support to his theory^u. In the same play at v. 209 Astaphium, who has previously been speaking with Diniarchus, is left alone on the stage. The

^s If Staphyla had left the stage, there would probably have been a new Scene and Scene-heading here in P^A (see below, p. 88). This suggests the possibility of some Scene-divisions in P, which are not found in A, having arisen from a mere stage-direction (see p. 89).

^t The 'anecdota Parisina,' edited by Reifferscheid among the Suetonius fragments, gives a list of the *notae quae versibus apponi consueverunt*, and adds: his solis in adnotationibus Ennii, Lucilii et historicorum usi sunt † uarroshennius † Aelius (i.e. Ael. Stilo) aequae et postremo Probus qui illas in Virgilio et Horatio et Lucretio apposuit ut Homero Aristarchus. The corruption has been emended variously (1) *Varro, Ennius* (if there was a grammarian of the same name as the poet), (2) *Vargunteius*, (3) *Varro, Sisenna*.

^u It may be objected that our minuscule MSS. evidently had a very obscure original to transcribe in the *Truculentus*. But its very obscurity may well have made them more exactly reproduce what they found in its pages. When a scribe understands what he is writing, it is then that he is least trustworthy.

Palimpsest makes no break, but in *CD* there is a blank line, while *B* indicates that a Scene-heading stood in the Archetype, viz., the name *ASTAPHIVM* preceded by its 'nota personae' and followed by some symbol or other. This symbol was interpreted by Dziatzko as a stichometrical number *VL*, i.e. 45, the number of lines in the Scene, an interpretation which seems very doubtful. The other supposed stichometrical number *LX* at the heading of *Trin. II ii*, is still more doubtful; it rather suggests that the scribe was going to write *LVSITELES* before *PHILTO*, but recognised his error after he had transcribed two letters. The H-like symbol in the margin of a later addition in *A* at *Stich. 623* is said not to be the symbol 'nota' (like our "N.B."), but merely a 'nota personae.' And so is the X-mark which preceded the Carthaginian passage in the *P^A* recension.

On the 'notae personarum' used to indicate the speakers throughout a Scene, see below, pp. 91 sqq. Here it may be mentioned that Greek letters were normally used, *A*, *B*, *Γ*, *Δ* (often confused in our MSS. with *A*), *E*, *Z*, etc., while the last letter of the Greek alphabet, *ω*, was employed to indicate that all the actors who were on the stage at the time joined in the speech. We find it probably at *Cas. 800*, where *Lysidamus* and *Olympio* join in the marriage-song :

OL. Suavi cantu concelebra omnem hanc plateam hymenaeo
mi (this is said to the *tibicen*).

ω Hymen hymenaeae o hymen,

certainly at the end of one or two plays, *Pers.*, *Poen.*, *Trin.* In the *Persa* it was accompanied (glossed?) by the stage-direction *πάντες*, which has led to the corruption *pantio* in our extant MSS. The same 'nota' or the same stage-direction in contracted form has been, I think, the origin of the curious *ite* of our minuscule MSS. at *Bacch. 1207*, and it is possible that the *GREX* and *CATERVA* offered by the same MSS. at the ends of various plays are mere interpretations of the same symbol. At *Epid. 732* *B* has *POETA*, *J* has *GREX*. (Can *plaudite plaudite* at the end of the *Curculio* represent *plaudite* with a marginal *πάντες*?)

Ritschl's explanation of *ω* as *CANTOR* (cf. *Hor. Epp. II iii*, 155) is disproved by the newly-found collation of the *Codex Turnebi*.

In regard to the arrangement of the plays there is one point for consideration to which sufficient attention has not, I think, been

paid. The earlier material for books was papyrus. The Herculanean papyri (not to go so far afield as Egypt), which formed the library of the Greek philosopher, Philodemus, shew us what the papyrus copies of the Early Empire were like. The several 'volumina' (*i.e.* books) were bound by a cord into a 'corpus' (*i.e.* volume), and a 'capsa' would contain one or (if there was room) more than one volume. Now there would be no difficulty in securing the right arrangement of the several books of a Greek philosophical work, Book I, Book II, Book III, &c. But each play of Plautus would be contained in a separate papyrus-roll. These rolls might be grouped in a number of 'corpora' and the whole collection assigned to one 'capsa' (if it was large enough); but how could the order of the several plays in each group be properly determined? That the arrangement in the time of Verrius Flaccus, and (to judge from the parallel case of Naevius) in the time of Varro too, was in alphabetical groups (an A-group, a C-group, and so on), we have already seen. The place of the *Amphitruo* at the beginning and of the *Vidularia* at the end of a collection of the twenty-one plays would no doubt be indicated by some notice that the collection began here and ended there. But there could be no means of determining the true order of the other two plays of the A-group, the *Asinaria* and *Aulularia*, or of the four of the C-group, *Captivi*, *Casina*, *Cistellaria*, *Curculio*. We now-a-days should not feel the difficulty, for we have carried alphabetical arrangement to a point further than the Romans of the Early Empire, and take account, as a matter of course, of the second letter, and, if need be, of the third and fourth too, for the purpose of arrangement. But the Romans at this time had not the idea of this minute subdivision^v. They lumped together anything that began with A, anything that began with C, and so on. So when the time came for the papyrus 'volumina' of the plays to

^v In the 'Parts I' of Festus' Epitome of Verrius Flaccus (see above, p. 20) there is indeed grouping by AB- and occasionally ABC-. But the proper order of the second (or third) letter is not taken into account. Thus Part I of the O-section is arranged so: Oc-, Or-, Ob- and Op-, Ol-, Off-, Oe-, Ou-, Os-. Our analysis of Nonius would be helped if we could fix a 'terminus a quo' for the modern alphabetical arrangement. For one of Nonius' lexicographical sources contained a list of Verbs and another of Adverbs in which the modern arrangement is followed (see No. I of this series), and we might be able to assign a date to it and find out something about the earlier authorities from which it is borrowed.

be written off on one (or more) parchment volume, the arrangement of the plays within each alphabetical group would be left to the caprice of the publisher. Unless therefore we are to assign to the two recensions, A^a and P^a, a later date than the papyrus period, we have no right to use the different order of the plays as evidence of anything more than different booksellers' issues. The order of the Archetypes of our two families of MSS. and of Nonius' copy (see above, p. 26) seems^{*} to have been :

<i>Ambrosian</i>	<i>Palatine</i>	<i>Nonius</i>	
Amph.—Asin.—Aul.	Amph.	Amph.	
	Asin.	Asin.	
	Aul.	Aul.	
Bacch.	Bacch.	Bacch.	
Capt.	Capt.	Cist.	
Curc.	Curc.	Cas.	
Cas.	Cas.	Capt.	
Cist.	Cist.	Curc.	
Epid.	Epid.	Epid.	
Merc.	Most.		} Merc.—Most.
Most.	Men.	Mil.	
Mil.	Mil.	Men.	
Men.	Merc.		
Poen.	Pseud.	Pers.	
Pers.	Poen.	Pseud.	
Pseud.	Pers.	Poen.	
Rud.	Rud.	Rud.	
Stich.	Stich.	Stich.	
Trin.	Trin.	Trin.	
Truc.	Truc.	Truc.	
Vid.	Vid.	Vid.	

* I take it to be a mere accident of transcription that Trin. Truc. follow Men. in *A*. The transposition of Bacch. after Epid. was effected in the Palatine text in mediaeval times. The gap at the end of Aul. and the beginning of Bacch. points to a large loss at this part in *P*. Presumably the remaining leaves of the Bacchides were loose and had dropped out of their place. The Carolingian abbot (if he it was) who gave them a position after the Epidicus was no doubt influenced by the allusion to this play in Bacch. 214. If the division of the plays into two volumes belonged to his time, then it was at the beginning of Vol. II that he inserted the loose leaves containing the Bacchides.

Punctuation in our extant MSS. of Latin authors generally dates from the Carolingian period. That the minuscule archetype of the Palatine MSS. retained some traces at least of ancient punctuation is clear from the Carthaginian passage in the *Poenulus*, where the words were separated by dots^y (preserved in a line or two by *B*). And at *Amph.* 523 the corrector (*B*³) of the *Codex Vetus*, whom I believe to have used for his corrections the minuscule archetype, has supplied the punctuation-mark omitted by the scribe of *B* after *abii*:

Clanculum abii : a legione operam hanc subripui tibi.

This was also the punctuation of the immediate original of *B* and *D*, for it is reproduced by *D*. And both the scansion *abii* | *a* in hiatus and the construction of *subripio* prove it to be right (cf. *Journ. Phil.* XXVI, 292). But whether this punctuation belonged to the actual P^A recension or was introduced by some later corrector we cannot say. The *Codex Bembinus* of Terence has been punctuated by a sixth-century corrector, whose name was Joviales^z. His punctuation sometimes agrees, sometimes disagrees with that recommended by Donatus in his commentary on Terence.

The manuscript tradition of Terence shews us the existence of an illustrated ancient edition. We have no trace^a of this in the case of Plautus.

(IV.) *The Arguments.*

These are post-Plautine, and are of two kinds, Acrostic and non-

^y Is there a trace of the same thing in *A* at v. 942?

^z That he was some learned friend of the owner of the codex may perhaps be inferred from the way in which he has signalized the completion of each instalment of his task by the entry: *huc usque Ioviales*. The similar services of Asterius bestowed on a friend's copy of Virgil are well known from the commemorative lines which have been preserved in the *Codex Medicus*:

Distinxi emendans gratum mihi munus amici

Suscipiens ; operi sedulus incubui, etc.

^a In *Harv. Stud.* IX 108 *n.* I have suggested that the curious titles *CHLAMY-DATVS*, 'the man in the travelling-cloak,' and *LVRCHIO* (?), 'the tippler,' assigned in the Scene-heading in our Palatine MSS. to the 'mercator' in the *Asinaria* and the 'puer ebrius' in the *Miles*, may conceivably have come from an accompanying picture with these words written beside the figures. But this is, of course, a mere guess. A more likely account will be found below, p. 96.

Acrostic. In both the archaic style is affected, not always with success (e.g. *itāque* Cist. arg. 10); in the Acrostic hiatus is a recognised feature of the verse, and is pushed far beyond the limits imposed by Plautus. The Palimpsest had originally no Arguments, but a later owner (5th cent.) has added non-Acrostic Arguments in Uncial script wherever a blank space was available (Pers., Pseud., Stich.). Everything indicates that they did not come from the original of which *A* is a copy, nor is there any reason for thinking that they came from any MS. embodying the *A*^A recension. In the Palatine Archetype the Acrostic Arguments were used. There are also here and there (Amph., Aul., Merc., Mil.) non-Acrostic Arguments. Since these latter sometimes (Amph., Aul.) precede, sometimes follow (Merc., Mil.) the Acrostic, we may perhaps infer that they were marginal additions which found their way into the text. The present state of the conclusion of the Mercator non-Acrostic Argument may point to the same thing.

So far then as the evidence goes, we may believe that the *A*^A edition had no Arguments, while the *P*^A edition was provided with Acrostic Arguments, and these must be earlier than the time of Donatus, if that commentator in his note on Andr. III v 4 (610) really quotes a phrase of the Argument to the Asinaria, strangely ascribing it to Plautus: sic Plautus locutus est 'pretium ob asinos' pro asinorum pretium. The non-Acrostic Arguments, each consisting of 12 lines, prefixed to the plays of Terence were the work of Sulpicius Apollinaris, the teacher of Aul. Gellius, in the first half of the second century; but of the date and authorship of those which ultimately found their way here and there into the text of the Palimpsest and of the Palatine archetype (or its original) we know nothing. Since they are not identical in the number^b of their lines, it is improbable that they came from one and the same bookseller's issue (much less 'third recension') of the plays. At any time an owner with a poetical gift, or with a friend so gifted, might embellish his copy with one or more Arguments, which would be transmitted in all subsequent transcriptions.

^b As examples of identity in the number of lines of metrical Arguments may be mentioned the Arguments in a Virgil-edition with 6 lines each, in an Ovid-edition with 10 lines each. The size of these Arguments in *A* is: Pers. (14), Pseud. (15), Stich. (9); in *P*: Amph. (10), Aul. and Mil. (15), Merc. (16 or 15).

(V.) The Didascaliae.

The Palimpsest had Didascaliae for the *Pseudolus* and *Stichus*, possibly for the *Rudens* (but the leaf is lost), also (but the page is quite illegible) for the *Vidularia*. It had apparently none for the *Mercator*, *Trinummus*, *Persa*. The extant fragments do not allow us to pronounce on the other plays. The Didascalia for the *Stichus* is best preserved. Apparently, like the Didascaliae in the Codex Bembinus of Terence, it was written partly in black, partly in red. The red lines have been washed out at the time when the manuscript became palimpsest, leaving the Didascalia in this form :

(blank space)

GRAECA ADELPHOE MENANDRV

ACTA LVDIS PLEBEIS

CN. BAEPIO C. TERENTIO AED. PL.

(blank line)

T. PVBLILIVS PELLIO

(blank line)

MARCIPOR OPPII

TIBIIS SARRANIS TOTAM

(blank line)

C. SVLPICIO C. AVRELIO COS.

(blank space)

So far as the evidence goes, we may conclude that the P^a edition had no Didascaliae, for there is absolutely no trace of them in our MSS. They would probably be the product of the earliest application of study to the plays; but the antiquarians of the Republic were, we may suppose, unable to furnish them in the case of the *Mercator*, *Persa*, *Trinummus* and probably other plays.

(VI.) The Scenes and Scene-headings.

In the differences which appear in the Palimpsest and in the Palatine MSS. in respect of Scene-division, there is clear trace of a difference of principle, which must be ascribed to the two rival recensions. Where, for instance, one speaker remains on the stage after the others have left it, the monologue is often not made into a new Scene in the A^a recension, unlike the P^a

recension. Examples are: Pseud. 667 (Pseudolus' monologue), 1238 (Simo's monologue); Truc. 209 (Astaphium's monologue). Similarly in the discrepancies at Pseud. 230, 1063, Pers. 711, Bacch. 530, Most. 783, where new Scenes begin in P^A but not in A^A, there is a clear difference of principle^c involved; also at Epid. 475, Pers. 7, where new Scenes begin in A^A but not in P^A.

As regards the form of the Scene-headings the question is obscure, owing to the accidents that have interfered with their transmission, particularly in the MSS. of the P^A edition. In discussing these it will be necessary to enter into some detail; for the true history of the Palatine Scene-headings has not, I think, been apprehended by scholars, and the question is by no means unimportant. The Scene-headings must have been an essential part of any ancient edition of Plautus and cannot be assigned (as the titles of Horace's and Catullus' odes are usually assigned) to a mere 'librarius' in the employment of some ancient bookseller. They may have come down from quite early times and have been in the main identical in the two recensions^d.

The normal form in ancient editions of Plautus, Terence, &c., was, to judge from the Codex Bembinus of Terence, a two-line heading, containing in the first line the name of the speaker, and in the second the character of his part, the rôle he had to play. Thus at Stich. II i, for example, we should have:

PINACIVM	GELASIMVS
PVER	PARASITVS.

^c Of course the failure to indicate a new Scene may often be the mere result of a copyist having failed to notice the blank line (left blank by the remissness of the rubricator) which had been reserved for the Scene-heading in his original. This he would be especially prone to do when the blank line stood at the top or bottom of a page. The ignoring of Pers. IV ix in A may be due to an error of this kind. But the confusion in our Palatine MSS. at Most. 1063 is the result of the disarrangement of the leaves of this play in some early archetype. At Aul. 328 I would ascribe the erroneous Scene-division in these MSS. to the lacuna in v. 328 having been mistaken for a space left blank for a heading. We have not the Palimpsest to afford a contrast of the A^A Scene-division with the curious breaks in the Palatine MSS. at Aul. 449, 731.

^d The alternative ending of the Poenulus (see above, p. 44) had no heading in A^A P^A. The Palatine MSS. leave an interval of one line; the Palimpsest goes on without a break. The two recensions also agree in not making a new Scene at Mil. 1427.

The order in which the speakers are enumerated follows^e the order in which they appear in the Scene. In this Scene of the Stichus Pinacium is the first speaker, Gelasimus speaks after him. But where two speakers had similar rôles (two old men, let us suppose, or two slaves), they would be enumerated together for sake of convenience, e.g. Pseud. I v :

SIMO CALLIPHO	PSEVDOLVS
SENES · II ·	SERVVS.

Here Simo is the first speaker, Pseudolus the second and Callipho the third ; and the departure from the true order is obviously necessitated by the convenience of having SENES · II · in the second line^f. The right order of the two 'senes' as compared with each other is adhered to (cf. Most. III ii). A variety of this normal form arose when some of the speakers were the same as had figured in the previous Scene. They might^g in that case be designated by the single word EIDEM, e.g. Poen. V v :

ANTAMOEINIDES	EIDEM
MILES	

^e The occasional exceptions, e.g. Vid. 69 in *A* :

DINIA NICODEMVS CACISTVS

(instead of Cac., Nic.), are, no doubt, due to a scribe's error (cf. Epid. I i in *A*, Mil. IV viii, Cas. III vi, Cas. IV ii in *P*).

^f It seems to me hyper-critical to object to the presence of the numeral *duo* and to argue that it could only appear when the names were suppressed or omitted. Certainly SIMO CALLIPHO SENES is sufficient in itself and does not need the addition of *duo*. But the Roman editors may quite well have followed the practice of adding the numeral.

^g This formula seems to have been singularly conducive to divergence of transcription. Possibly the best explanation is that scribes were tempted to expand EIDEM and substitute for it the actual names. Thus at Poen. V iii where *A* offers IDEM and *P* gives the names, the difference may not really be attributable to the two recensions. Whether the type found occasionally in *P*^A, e.g. at Cist. I ii, was also found in *A*^A, we cannot say : LENA RESTITIT. *Resto*, be it noticed, is Plautus' own expression for remaining on the stage, e.g. Trin. 718 Abiit ille quidem . . . Hic quoque hinc abiit. Stasime, restas solus. There are a large number of one-line Scene-headings in the Palimpsest, now blank, but presumably at some time filled with writing. In fact until the Casina the one-line heading would seem to have been normal in *A*, also throughout the Menaechmi, and often elsewhere. (See, however, the remarks on this matter in the Preface to Studemund's Apograph.) At Pers. IV vi I think both *A*^A and *P*^A had : LENO [? ac] EIDEM.

Another feature of Scene-headings was the appending of the symbols ^h · C · (i.e. Canticum) and · DV · (i.e. Deverbium or Diverbium) to indicate the presence or absence of musical accompaniment. Another was the presence of those 'notae personarum' which throughout the Scene itself were used to indicate the different speakers.

What then are the accidents which have interfered with the transmission of these Scene-headings of the two rival recensions? In the Palimpsest, where, as we have seen, two lines have usually been reserved for a Scene-heading, the first line (containing the names) remains, the second line is blank. Thus the Scene-heading at Stich. II i, mentioned above, appears thus in *A* :

PINACIVM GELASIMVS

(blank line)

We may infer that (as we found to have probably been the case with the Didascaliae) the blank line had been filled in by the 'rubricator.' The red pigment had been washed off when in mediaeval times the MS. was prepared to receive another piece of writing. Where a one-line Scene-heading occurs in *A*, the line is as a rule blank; it had been, we may suppose, written in red letters. The result of this accident to the transmission is that we are left ignorantⁱ of the nomenclature of the rôles in the Palimpsest. All that has been handed down to us of the Scene-headings of the *A*^a recension is the proper names. We are of course entitled to infer that the second lines, now blank, contained the rôles, and we may perhaps also infer that the Symbols · C · and · DV · were likewise present in the Palimpsest, being written (as such symbols naturally might be) in red pigment. There are

^h Leo assigns these to the second century A.D. on the ground that the contraction of Deverbium would at an earlier time have taken the form, not of DV, but of DEV. But this reasoning is not conclusive. Surely any scribe or editor, who found in an older copy the old-fashioned type of contraction, would alter it to the type current in his own day. I gather from Donatus' Preface to the *Adelphi* that these symbols stood after the names in the first line of the heading.

ⁱ By some freak, I suppose, of the scribe we find in *A* at Mil. III i and Rud. II vii a two-line heading with the rôles written in black in the first line, and with the second line blank, thus reversing the usual order of things. In Stich. V iv, where *A* offers merely TIBICINA, this is probably to be explained by the ancient practice (see below) of not assigning names to 'mutae personae' and quite subordinate personages (but cf. I ii, II ii of the same play).

blank spaces for 'notae personarum' throughout the Scenes; so presumably they were in red too. And they may have been entered (in red) beside the names in the Scene-headings; for the Codex Bembinus of Terence, which has the proper names in black in the first line of a heading and the rôles in red in the second line, shews the 'notae personarum' in red standing in the first line, each before the name it represents. We cannot say how far they were identical^k with the P^A symbols¹ or followed a lettering of their own.

Far more obscure is the history of the Palatine recension in respect to the transmission of the Scene-headings. Any reader of the best extant MS. (*B*) of the Palatine family is at once struck by the number of what we may style single-line headings (cf. Berl. Phil. Woch. XII 253). These contain, as a rule, the names of the rôles, not of the speakers. At Stich. II i, to take our previous example, the best extant copy of the Palatine recension has merely:

PVER PARASITVS.

^k The use of the identical 'nota' E for the 'leno' in both recensions at Poen. 474 is suggested by the error found in both *A* (*A*¹) and *P*, *evolaticorum* for *vol-* (cf. below), perhaps also, A for Stasimus in Trin. 495. Errors like this in *A* (cf. Mil. 173, Cist. 518, &c.) suggest that in *A*'s original or archetype these 'notae' were occasionally in black ink like the text. The same kind of error is very frequent in the Palatine text (e.g. Mil. 276, 1138, Most. 719, 750, Aul. 829, Stich. 542, Trin. 931, Truc. 690; cf. Poen. 140; Men. 151). That scribes at an early time had the habit of expanding these contracted symbols and substituting the actual name, may be inferred from a common corruption in our MSS., viz. the omission of a name (in the vocative case usually) which is immediately followed by a remark of a speaker bearing this name. Also from an error like that of the Palatine MSS. at Pseud. 954:

Illicinest? Illic'st. Mala mercest, Pseudole; illuc sis vide,

where our MSS. shew instead of *Pseudole* the 'nota personae.'

¹ In the Palatine MSS. the speakers are so often erroneously indicated that an editor may ignore their testimony with but little scruple. In particular the error of assigning the opening words, instead of the middle or end, of a line to a new speaker is so frequent as to rouse the suspicion that the paragraphos-symbol stood in the margin of some early archetype. In the recently found Greek Dramatic papyri sometimes this symbol, sometimes the name of the speaker is used. In the Ambrosian Palimpsest (5th cent.?) of Seneca's Tragedies there is a curious practice of assigning a new line to the second part of a verse which is divided between two speakers. This practice has led to the loss of a half-line at Oed. 399 (see Studemund, p. xix of Leo's preface to Seneca). I do not know that there is any trace of this practice in the Palatine tradition.

This feature might be passed over as devoid of significance, since our extant MSS. are separated from the Palatine recension by a number of centuries, were it not that there are unmistakable traces of some defect in the transmission of the proper names in all this family of MSS. The name of a leading character in the *Casina*, the old reprobate, Lysidamus, does not occur in our Palatine Scene-headings; we learn it from the Palimpsest. In the *Menaechmi* we have not the Palimpsest to help us at the requisite parts of the play, and so we are left in ignorance of the name of the wife of the Epidamnian twin-brother. We find nothing in the Palatine headings but the name of the rôle, MVLIER. The name Lampadio appears in the Palatine headings in the *Cistellaria* as LAMPADISCVS, and so on. How are we to account for this? Some scholars suppose that Plautus did not assign a name to some of his characters, and that ancient editors, or even 'librarii,' might supply any name that suited their fancy. No name, they say, was given to the old reprobate in the *Casina*. The editor of the A^A recension chose to call him Lysidamus. The editor of the P^A recension chose to leave him unnamed. This seems to me extremely unlikely in the case of the leading characters of a play, like Lysidamus in the *Casina* and Menaechmus' wife in the *Menaechmi*, although it is conceivable for minor personages, such as the 'senex' in Terence *Eun.* V v^m. Far more likely is the supposition that by some accident the names of Lysidamus in the *Casina* and of the matron in the *Menaechmi* had dropped out of all the Scene-headings of some archetype in these plays. Why then were they not restored by the next scribe who took a copy of this archetype? The answer is clear. *Because it so happens that these two names do not occur at any part of the text.*

Further consideration shews usⁿ that all the names which are given correctly in the headings are such as could easily be recovered from the text itself, so that what has certainly happened in the *Casina*, *Menaechmi*, &c., we may suppose to have happened in all the other plays too. Also that there are positive indications

^m He appears only in this Scene, a short Scene of some thirty lines, and nowhere else in the play. Donatus says of him: *huius senex nomen apud Terentium non est; apud Menandrum Simon dicitur.* The Bembinus has DEMEA, the other MSS. LACHES.

ⁿ For details, I refer the reader to the article by my old pupil, Mr. H. Prescott, in *Harvard Studies*, Vol. IX, pp. 102 sqq.

that this did actually happen throughout the volume, for certain errors in the presentment of names in headings can be traced to peculiarities of the text^o. The name Lampadio, we have seen, has in the Cistellaria headings of Palatine MSS. the form Lampadiscus both at its first occurrence (II ii) and subsequently (IV i, ii). Why? Evidently because in the text the slave is first mentioned (v. 544) under the pet-name:

Audire vocem visa sum ante aedis modo
Mei Lampadisci servi.

For the old man of the Casina the Palatine MSS. offer in some Scene-headings an impossible substitute for the true name Lysidamus, viz. STALICIO. This is exactly what a blunderer might elicit from the corrupt reading of this family of MSS. in v. 960, where Chalinus calls out to Lysidamus:

heus! sta ilico,

of which the Palatine reading is:

heus stalicio.

The blunder was confirmed by the change of the puzzling word *tittibilicio* in v. 347 into *tibi Stalicio* (-cio):

non ego istuc verbum empsim tittibilicio (*tit tibi stalicio* P),

a change which would seem to have been made after, rather than before, the acceptance of the fictitious name.

If the reader will take the trouble^p of going through the Scene-headings, he will find that each and every one squares with this theory. Of course the vast majority of the characters are mentioned by name in the text itself, and so the actual number of instances

^o We have no such indications in the Palimpsest. So that while we are entitled to infer that the names in the Palatine Scene-headings are later insertions from the text, we are not entitled to make this inference regarding the Ambrosian Scene-headings. We are not entitled, for example, to declare boldly that the name Lysidamus in the Casina may have been found by the scribe of some original of *A* in a part now lost of the text and thereupon inserted in the Scene-headings. Such a theory is wholly baseless. There is absolutely no indication of anything of the kind.

^p Readers, I know, will not take the trouble, and so I am not confident of this theory being accepted until someone writes a dissertation on the Scene-headings of Plautus and gives a full list of them all, or at least the more noticeable, one after another.

relevant to our argument are few. But it is not right to turn this paucity of crucial instances into an objection against the theory. If the vast majority of instances are capable of being explained equally well on either hypothesis, either as directly transmitted or as recovered from the text, then it is on the few remaining instances that the proof of the true hypothesis must of necessity depend⁹. A more reasonable objection has been made on this score, that these (according to our theory) re-written Scene-headings shew as a rule the correct order of the names, the order which corresponds to the actual order of the speakers in the ensuing dialogue. This objection must be narrowed down to its true limit. Since our theory posits the direct transmission of the rôles, e.g. at Stich. II i :

PVER PARASITVS,

the direct transmission of the order of the names (though not of the names themselves) is in most cases involved. The only cases which the objection can refer to are the few headings where the speakers bear the same rôle, e.g. SENES · II ·. But surely any scribe or 'corrector' who filled in the names of the 'duo senes' with the help of the text would naturally place them in the order in which they appear in the following lines. I for my part can hardly imagine him to have deliberately adopted any other order, and am inclined to ascribe the exceptions (e.g. Merc. II ii) to a mere transposition^r by a scribe, of the same sort as the transposition of two words in a line. The scribe of the 12th century MS. *J* (or rather, I fancy, of the common parent of *J* and *O*) has placed the 'senes duo' of Epid. V ii in their right order. He certainly found nothing in his original except SENES · II · (so in *BE*). But a more telling example, one which, in my opinion, suffices of itself to destroy the whole objection, is that in the Mostellaria (v. 858), where the transposition of leaves in some Palatine archetype had oc-

⁹ I admit, however, that the slightness of the material will always leave room for suspicion regarding the extent to which the original names in the Scene-headings had disappeared. In *A* we see occasionally the rôles preserved instead of the names (cf. above). A similar freak may have disturbed the uniformity of the Palatine recension. Where this recension offered one-line headings I believe them to have survived in their original form (cf. above).

^r Another 'causa erroris' may have been the mis-writing of the 'notae personarum' in the Scene-headings (see below).

casioned the re-writing of the traditional Scene-headings, the re-writer presented precisely the order required by the accident to the text :

ADVERSITORES TRANIO THEVROPIDES SIMO DANISTA.

For the disarranged state of the lines exhibits this arrangement : 858-883, 802-841, 601-646. The first speaker is Phaniscus, one of the 'adversitores,' the next (at v. 803) Tranio, then Theopropides, then Simo, finally (at v. 603) the 'danista.'

These are, so far as I know, the only objections that have been offered to this theory of the accidental loss of the proper names in the Palatine Scene-headings and of their subsequent restoration with the help of the text. The theory so exactly suits the facts that it must, I think, hold the field until it is definitely disproved. It follows that the names in the Scene-headings of our Palatine MSS. are to be regarded as devoid of all traditional authority. Accident therefore has deprived us on the one hand of the rôles in the A^A Scene-headings, and on the other of the names in the P^A headings, and we have not the means of making a comparison between the Scene-headings of the two recensions ; although we may fairly re-construct the ancient type of headings by a combination of the valid materials^s preserved by the Palimpsest and by the Palatine MSS. We cannot, for example, infer that in the Scene-headings of the *Poenulus* the Carthaginian was designated differently in A^A and P^A. In A^A indeed (at least in *A*) he certainly appears merely as POENVVS ; but we no right to assign to P^A the fuller heading indicated by our Palatine MSS. :

HANNO

POENVVS.

P^A may perfectly well have had the same heading as A^A ; for the HANNO of our MSS. has, our theory shews, been transferred from

^s I see no reason to doubt that the rôle of Harpax in the *Pseudolus* was styled in ancient times CACVLA (*P, A n.l.*), and of Simia in the same play, SYCOPHANTA (*P, A n.l.*). Possibly even the designation of *Pseudolus* in the concluding scene of the play as SERVVS EBRIVS (*P, A n.l.*) may have been the accepted designation in ancient editions. It is possible that MERCATOR CHLAMYDATVS, 'the merchant in the travelling-cloak,' was a similar rôle-title in the *Asinaria*, and even PVER LVRCIO(-CHO), 'the tipling slave,' in the *Miles* (see above, p. 86). Whether the name *Truculentus* comes from a rôle-designation SERVVS TRVCVLENTVS is discussed below.

the text into the headings. Nor can we assert that a custom of ^A was alien to the P^A headings, viz. of not giving the names 'mutae personae' or quite subordinate characters, and appeal Aul. II iv, where our Palatine MSS. offer PHRVSIUM EXELEVSIVM BICINAE · II ·. These names have been taken from a line (v. 333) the same Scene.

Until the recent discovery of the partial collation of the Codex Urnebi we had no means of dating this accident that has occurred the Palatine Scene-headings. That codex however now appears have had substantially the same headings as the parent of our other minuscule MSS. These defective and wrongly supplied names TALICIO, LAMPADISCVS, etc.) we may refer to the common parent T and the other minuscule codices, in other words to the ancient majuscule Archetype. The latest possible date for the arbitrary re-writing of the first lines of the Palatine Scene-headings is thus pushed back to some early century (3rd—5th). We cannot ascribe to the Carolingian abbot who first found the ancient codex in the library of some monastery (shall we guess Fleury?) and gave to his monks to transcribe in minuscule characters; for names in the fragmentary plays, PHANOSTRATA in the Cistellaria, PHEDRIA and FITODICVS in the Aulularia, have been recovered for the Scene-headings by help of portions of the text which were undoubtedly missing at that time as they are now. The date of the accident to the transmission of the Palatine Scene-headings must therefore be very early.

But it may be asked (and here, to my mind, lies the strongest line of attack upon this theory), 'How can we be sure that all these re-writings of the traditional Scene-headings were made at one and the same time?' The possibility of successive scribes and correctors having each contributed their quota of alterations cannot be denied. For example, the mediaeval editor^t, who prepared the 'doctored' version of the first eight plays from which the MSS. A and O, and the corrections (V²) in the MS. V were derived, undoubtedly 'doctored' the Scene-headings^u as well as the text

The little poem which he prefixed to his edition is well known :

Exemplar mendum tandem me compulit ipsum, etc.

Sometimes successfully. At Asin. IV ii his original had ADOLESCENS CYRIPPVS ET (?) PARASITVS · DV · which I take to have been an early re-writing of:

(blank spaces interspersed by 'notae pers.' and followed by · DV ·)

ADOLESCENS PARASITVS.

(e.g. *Curc.* I iii, IV ii). For these eight plays the nearest view that we can get of the Archetype's readings is provided by the corrections (*B*³) in the *Codex Vetus* (*B*). I believe them to come straight from the minuscule archetype of our extant MSS. But this corrector has also interspersed corrections of the text on his own responsibility. Now the Scene-heading of *Amph.* IV ii in *B* shews the name BLEFARO introduced by him, where the other MSS. point to an original MERCVRIVS ET IDEM. Similarly he changes PROLOGVS at *Cist.* I iii into PROLOGVS AVXILII DEI (cf. v. 154 nam mihi Auxilio est nomen). Are these emendations of his own, or part of that general re-writing of the Scene-headings which our theory would ascribe to an early date? If the latter, then we shall have to refer the gap in the *Amphitruo* to this early time; for the addition of the name Blepharo at IV ii betokens ignorance of the fact that Blepharo does not really appear till a later Scene. The transposition of the leaves in the *Mostellaria* already mentioned must be equally early if the Scene-heading of *Most.* IV i was (as I certainly am inclined to believe) re-written at the same time as the others. Again as evidence that the scribe of *D* had introduced modifications of his own the Scene-heading of *Trin.* III iii might be quoted, where the common original of *B C D* had undoubtedly no names but only the rôle SENES · II ·, but where the scribe of *D* has written *Philot Callicles senes · II ·*. Here however his mistake, *Philot* instead of *Megaronides*, gives us a clue to the real explanation. In the common original (the minuscule archetype) of the three MSS the entry SENES · II · was accompanied not only by the symbol DV (found in *B* and *C*) but also by the 'notae personarum.' The 'nota' used for *Megaronides* in this Scene is identical with that used in previous Scenes for *Philot*. What the scribe of *D* has done was not, strictly speaking, to add by his own contribution two proper names, but merely to write in full these 'notae' which he found in his original; in short he has done nothing more than any scribe who writes *pater* in full instead of the contracted *pr* of his original. Nevertheless there is no denying of the possibility of successive copyists and correctors having contributed, here a little and there a little, to the alteration of these Scene-

The re-writer had not noticed that the 'adolescens' in this Scene is not the same 'adolescens' as in the previous Scenes, viz. 'Argyrippus,' but a new 'adolescens,' viz. *Diabolus*. *J* offers 'Diabolus' instead of 'Argyrippus.'

headings, although, if the commonly accepted view^x of the genealogy of our MSS. be correct, the successive stages of transcription are extremely few. And here is the weak point of our theory. How can we prove that this or that re-writing of a Scene-heading actually goes back to the early date we assign? May not the early Archetype (in Rustic Capital Script) of *TBCD* have had the Scene-headings in the *Casina* and *Menaechmi* in full and correct form? May not the omission of the names of *Lysidamus* and of *Menaechmus'* wife be due to the scribe of the minuscule archetype of *BCD* and the interpolation of the fictitious *STALICIO* to some subsequent transcriber? What makes our theory weak against an attack of this kind is the fact that we have not the evidence of the *Codex Turnebi* (*T*) for these plays^y, but only for the *Persa*, *Poenulus* and parts of the *Bacchides*, *Pseudolus* and *Rudens*. Now it is the consensus of *T* with *BCD* which takes us back to the early majuscule archetype, while the consensus of *BCD* (without *T*) takes us only to the Carolingian minuscule archetype. We can assert positively that the majuscule archetype had, e.g. in *Rud.* I iv. :

^x That the minuscule archetype of *BCDEIJO* was immediately transcribed from the early majuscule archetype and was the immediate source of the *B*³-corrections in the first eight plays and the immediate original of *B* in the last twelve. Will not some one who has leisure examine the readings of *BCD* in the last twelve plays and settle once for all the question whether there is any indication of a second minuscule MS. having intervened between *B* and the minuscule archetype? The close relationship of *B* to *D* in the first eight plays is not, I think, affected by Zangemeister's pronouncement that *B* is later than *D*. For the difference in age cannot be considerable. The theory suggested by certain blanks left by *B*¹ (e.g. at *Curc.* 534, 538), viz., that *B* was written at a time when certain passages (transcribed in *D* and the original of *IEJ*) had been lost or obscured in the common original of *BDIEJ*, is hardly warranted. These blanks are the mere result of the habit of the scribe of *B* to omit anything that puzzled him, and to leave it for the corrector (*B*³) to supply. What puzzled him in these two lines of the *Curculio* was the forms *capse* and *capso* (cf. Schoell's note on *Cas.* 347).

^y At the same time it might be inferred from the silence of Turnebus that he did not find at least the name *Lysidamus* in the *Casina*. And since *Cas.* 347, through the timid habit of the scribe of the *Codex Vetus*, was only written by him as far as the fifth (not fourth) word, the puzzling termination of the line being left to the corrector to supply, the fictitious name is attested by *B*³, that is (if our theory of the 'stemma codicum' be right) by the minuscule archetype itself.

PALAESTRA AMPELISCA · C ·

MVLIERES · II ·

and at Pseud. IV ii (where the Palimpsest shews BALLIO PSEVDOLVS SIMIA followed by a blank line which presumably contained the rôles):

BALLIO IDEM · C ·

and at Pseud. IV vii :

CACVLA LENO SENEX,

and at Bacch. IV i :

PARASITVS PVER ADOLESCENS,

and so on. For all or most of the Scene-headings in the parts for which the newly found collation *T* helps us, we can confidently reject the possibility of a later origin of this or that modification. We can recover the 'ipsa verba' of the majuscule archetype² without any fretting uncertainty. Now it is the practical uniformity of the 'ipsa verba' in these headings with the best tradition³ of the MSS. *B C D* in these parts of Plautus which encourages us to believe that the same uniformity prevailed in other parts too. On the other hand, if any objector requires absolute proof in each and every instance, we can only admit that the proof is not procurable and that it will remain so until some lucky chance gives us the rest of the collation of the Codex Turnebi. But we may in our

² We can therefore state as a fact that the name SIMIA never appeared in the Pseudolus Scene-headings but only the rôle SYCOPHANTA. How well this suits our theory! Since our modern distinction of proper names by the use of capital initial letters was unknown in MSS., this name, though it occurs here and there in the text, might easily be taken for the noun *simia* (later *simmia*) 'a monkey.' In the Argument *Simiae* (*Simmiae*) shews in all our MSS. the corruption *si nimiae*, a corruption which appears to go back to a period of majuscule script SIMMIAE.

³ Sometimes *B* and *C* fail us and we have to fall back on *D* alone, a much weaker testimony. For example, in Rud. III iv where *D* has DAEMONES SENEX and where the rubricators of *B C* have omitted the Scene-heading, we find in *T* what I believe to have been the 'ipsa verba' of the Archetype, viv. SENEX preceded by the 'nota personae' A. In Aul. II vi the form of the Scene-heading in our extant Palatine MSS. enables us at least to refer the heading to one stage earlier of transmission. Both *B* and *V* offer STROBILVS SERVVS STAPHILA ANVS COCVS HYL. Here the last item was clearly a marginal correction in some archetype of the spelling STAPHILA.

turn demand from the objector (and really this is all that is required for our present purpose) that he for his part shall cease to speak of the names in the Palatine Scene-headings as if they certainly came by direct transmission from the Palatine recension itself^b.

The exact nature of the accident is not quite certain; but the simplest and most natural way in which the first line of a Scene-heading would become blank would be through the remissness of a rubricator. The scribe himself would supply the black line (in this case presumably the second line) of the heading, and would leave the other line for the rubricator to fill in. If the P^A-headings had a form identical with that exhibited by the Codex Bembinus of Terence and possibly exhibited, as we have seen, by the Plautus Palimpsest, and if the only difference was that the P^A-heading shewed red where the Bembinus and *A* shewed black and vice versa, then the parts of the P^A-headings which the scribe himself would supply would be (1) the 'notae personarum' in the first line, (2) the rôles in the second line, (3) the symbols DV and C (presumably in the first line); the part which he would leave for the rubricator to supply would be (4) the proper names. Undoubtedly the nearest glimpse that we can get of the Palatine archetype, by the help of the more accurate of the extant MSS. in their most accurate portions, shews some such form of heading

^b On the strength of the presence of the name Euclio in the heading of the last Scene of the fragmentary *Anulularia* in our Palatine MSS. :

STROBILVS	LICONIDES	EVCLIO
SERVVS	ADOLESCENS	SENEX,

it is argued that Euclio must have figured in the lost part (the play breaks off in our MSS. at v. 831) of this Scene and that therefore this Scene provided the dénouement of the play. Our theory shews that all that really was directly transmitted from the Palatine recension was :

SERVVS	ADOLESCENS	SENEX.
--------	------------	--------

Those objectors who insist on assigning to a minuscule archetype or even to extant MSS. the interpolation of STALICIO in the *Casina* and LAMPADISCVS in the *Cistellaria* will, if they are consistent, insist on the possibility of SENEX having really referred to Megadorus here and of EVCLIO being a mere guess of some scribe.

Our theory, while it admits the possibility of EVCLIO being right, requires, however, at least one more Scene than this one for the fifth Act of the play, a Scene namely (or Scenes) from whose text the names PHEDRIA (FE-) and FITODICVS were taken by the re-writer of the headings of IV vii and II vii.

in which only the red portion would be lacking, and confirms the possibility of a rubricator's remissness having been the sole and efficient cause^c.

The Scene-headings of Plautus are not devoid of importance^d for the editor of the text. It will then be convenient to devote the last part of this section to an examination of some problems by the new light of our hypothesis :

(1) The names of the sisters in the Stichus :—

I take it that the A^A recension or some copy offered for the wife of Epignomus the alternative names Panegyris and Philumena. Its first Scene-heading (possibly also II ii, where the Palimpsest has PANEGYRIS) had this form :

SEU PHILUMENA
PANEGYRIS PAMPHILA
MVLIERES · II ·

Panegyris is the name adopted in the text (vv. 247, 331) of both recensions. The alternative Philumena I would ascribe to the 'Revival' text, for it is patently an improvement of Panegyris, suggested by the name of the sister Pamphila and her husband Pamphilippus. The three names are admirably suitable to the loving family that is so charmingly portrayed in the play. But if the play was twice presented in Plautus' life-time, the new name may be the poet's own 'second thought.' Whether P^A offered an alternative like A^A or confined itself to the mention of one name for the wife of Epignomus cannot be stated. Our theory of the names in the Scene-headings of the Palatine MSS. shews that the PANEGYRIS which appears in them has been taken from the

^c Another possibility, the origin of Scene-headings from miniatures, is maintained for MSS. of Terence by Mr. J. Watson in an article (in *Harvard Studies*, Vol. XIV) which has just appeared.

^d For example, we have seen that their conventional order follows the order of the speakers' appearance in the Scene. In *Mil. IV iv* *AP* agree in putting PLEVSICLES ADVLESCENS before PALAESTRIO SERVVS. So the words *et ego vos* in v. 1138 are by some assigned to Pleusicles, not Palaestrio (but cf. 1132 sqq.). After *Epid. 189* something may have been lost. For the opening words of the next line, *continuo ut maritus fiat*, are clearly the words of Apocides, whereas the Scene-heading in the Palimpsest, EPIDICVS PERIPHANES APOCIDES, if not a mere transposition (as in I i), shews that Periphanes took part in the dialogue before Apocides. The Palatine MSS. have the other order. By our theory all that was actually transmitted in their case was SENES · II ·.

text, the name that originally stood (whatever it may have been) in the Scene-heading having been lost at an early period. The name of the second sister does not occur in the text. The A^A recension offers PAMPHILA without any alternative. The re-writer of the Palatine Scene-headings thought that he had discovered the name in the text at v. 284 :

Proinde ut decet amat virum suum ; nunc expedi Pinacium

(so the Palatine MSS. for *expetit, nunc Pinacium*), where the slave Pinacium is of course the person mentioned. Hence the PINACIVM or (with confusion of D for P) DINACIVM in our extant MSS. If we bear in mind the true hypothesis of the transmission of the names in the Palatine Scene-headings, we shall see the incorrectness of the common view, viz. that the P^A recension named the sisters PANEGYRIS and DINACIVM, while in the A^A recension they figured as PHILVMENA and PAMPHILA.

(2) The names of the slaves in the Truculentus.

Renaissance MSS. give the name of the surly slave as STRATILAX ; and it is strange that their worthless authority should have caused the acceptance of this name in the large Teubner edition. It is patently a corruption of STRABAX (possibly written STRAUAX like UALLIO for BALLIO Pseud. IV ii in *Z*) in some Scene-heading of the Palatine MSS. Strabax is of course the 'adulescens rusticus.' The Palimpsest, as we have seen, gives the proper names, not the rôles, in its Scene-headings ; and since it offers at II ii

TRVCULENTVS ASTAPHIVM

followed by a blank line, in which we may suppose to have been written in red pigment

SERVVS ANCILLA,

I have little doubt that Truculentus was the actual name, and that Astaphium's remark in v. 265 :

Nimis quidem hic truculentust,

was in the way of a pun, like the pun on the name Epidicus in Epid. 25 or Pinacium in Stich. 271.

The other slave was called Cuamus, as appears from the Palatine text (which in this play is in a woefully corrupt state) in vv.

583, 586, 702. The re-writer of the Palatine Scene-headings believed it to be GETA on the strength of v. 577 :

Inbeo vos salvere. Et nos te, Geta ; quid agis ? ut vales ?

where all that is meant is ' a Getan slave.'

(On the real names of the tippling slave in the Miles and the man in the travelling cloak (*chlamydat*) in the Asinaria, see above, p. 96).

(VII.) *Errors common to the two Recensions.*

The two copies, *A* and *P*, of two rival recensions, *A*^A and *P*^A, are only ' blurred ' copies. One cause that has confused their outlines is the inevitable tendency of scribes to make mistakes. The immediate original of *A* has, we may be sure, by no means been faithfully transcribed in *A* itself, and the remote archetype of *A* is still less faithfully reproduced. The case of *P* is even worse. In the parts for which we have not the evidence of *T*, all that we can appeal to is the testimony of a minuscule archetype ; and who can say how many errors have been made by the mediaeval German monk (or monks) who penned it ? Could we recover in these parts the majuscule archetype, we should certainly find that in scores of passages it had identically the same correct text as *A*, where our MSS. (*B*, *C*, *D*, etc.) all have gone wrong, through the error of this German monk-scribe. Here are some examples which the newly found collation of *T* has revealed to us : Pers. 536 : mihi *AP* (*om.*) ; 629 eveniant *AP* (*convenient*) ; Poen. 310 quia *AP* (*qui*) ; 472 quom *AP* (*quo*) ; 860 dignus qui siet *AP* (*om.*) ; 977 punicast guggast homo *AP* (*om.*) ; 1019 tu aliud sapis *AP* (*tua*) ; 1036 (*tu*) *om. AP* ; 1204 addunt *AP* (*om.*).

And on the other hand a great deal of the apparent harmony of *A* with our minuscule MSS. is equally specious. In Pseud. 1326 the mistake of *reddi* for *redi* is found in *A*. It did not appear in the majuscule nor yet in the minuscule archetype, but it intruded upon that late transcript which was the original of our MSS. *C* and *D*. In Trin. 530 the same mistake, *reddit* for *redit*, is found in *A* and the minuscule archetype. But how can we be sure that it was also found in the majuscule archetype and did not first intrude at the Carolingian period ? Errors of this kind are at all times a temptation to a scribe, and there is every possibility that

the scribe of *A* and the scribe of some copy of the other recension fell into them independently. We have therefore no right to take for granted, as is generally done, that *A*^A and *P*^A exhibited a consensus in such errors as Trin. 773 *gererem* for *gerere rem*, Pseud. 98 *libellae* for *libellai*, Poen. 876 *resistam* for *res sistam*, 669 *accurre* for *accures*. It is extraordinary how many treatises on the two recensions of Plautus have assumed that, because natural miswritings like these are found in our extant minuscule MSS., they must have been present in the majuscule archetype, and even, a still more dangerous inference, that they existed in some imaginary original from which both *A*^A and *P*^A were derived. A much less natural miswriting, *hamum* for *hamulum*, has been made in Stich. 289 independently by the scribe of the original of *C* and *D* and by the scribe of *A* (or the original of *A*). The reading of both the majuscule and the minuscule archetype (as of *B*) was *hamulum*. Had *B* not retained the true form, we should have imagined that *hamum* was the reading of *P* (cf. Pers. 572 *anulum* for *anellum*). The discovery of the collation of *T* has revealed to us a number of errors introduced into the text for the first time by the scribe of the minuscule archetype. Great care therefore is necessary in compiling a list of the passages in which *A* and this archetype exhibit either on the one hand a divergence of reading, or on the other a consensus in error. And even when we have clear evidence for the reading of *A* and *P*, we have still to assure ourselves whether *A* and *P* in this respect offer a faithful or a blurred reflection of the two rival recensions from which they have originated.

Only a little study of the critical apparatus of the large Teubner edition of Plautus is needed to convince us how inevitable are the corruptions which are so recklessly offered and so thoughtlessly accepted as 'Errors common to the two Recensions.' I mean corruptions like *eveniat* for *evenat* (Trin. 41), *ut* for *uti* (Poen. 1289 and passim), *opinor* for *opino* (Bacch. 487 and passim), *illic* (dat.) for *illic* (Mil. 351, etc.), as well as *illic* (adv.) for *illi*, *illum* for *illunc* (Poen. 1302, etc.), *possim* for *possiem* (Pers. 319) and *sim* for *siem*, *possum* for *potis* (*pote*) *sum* (Pseud. 355), *-ae* (gen.) for *ai* (Pseud. 98, etc.), and other misspellings like *habeas* for *abeas* (Pseud. 393), *scimus* for *simus* (Pseud. 683), *honestam* for *onustam* (Pseud. 1306), *hostium* for *ostium* (Most. 768). The newly found evidence of *T* shews us how often such errors originated in the

minuscule archetype and were not found in the majuscule, even when they appear in *A*, e.g. Pers. 442 *qum* *P*, *quin* *A B C D*. Similarly the evidence of *B* shews us when they are to be referred to the scribe of the original of *C* and *D* and not to the minuscule archetype, e.g. Trin. 371 *tolerabilis* *A C D*, *tolerabis* *P*; Mil. 374 *mihi possunt* *A C D*, *possunt mihi* *P*; Men. 1132 *postquam* *A C D*, *post quem* *B*. No argument whatever regarding the ancient recensions *A*^a and *P*^a can be based on consensus in errors of this description, even though such consensus could be established for *A* and *P*. In Poen. 365 we have the express testimony of Gellius (reproduced by Nonius) that Plautus wrote *mea delicia*. This O. Lat. unfamiliar form appears in the familiar guise *meae deliciae* in *A* and *P*; but it would be rash to assert that *meae deliciae* was the deliberate reading of the editor of one or other (or both) of the rival recensions, and not a mere mistake committed separately by transcribers of the text^e.

The full information which the new Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum now provides regarding the glossaries or ancient dictionaries has facilitated the detection of apparent divergences in *A* and *P* which are rather errors of transcription, due to the substitution of a suprascript gloss for the actual word of the text, than varieties of reading. *Rogo*, for example, is the stock interpretation of O. Lat. *oro* in the dictionaries of the Empire; and so *rogas*, the reading of *A* in Most. 682 (cf. *P* in Pers. 321, p. 73 above):

bonum aequomque oras,

is not to be attributed to the editor of the recension which *A* embodies, but merely to the error of a scribe who found in his original:

rogas

bonum aequomque oras

^e In the case of these O. Lat. forms which were systematically changed by scribes at all periods, ancient and mediaeval, alike, e.g. *illi* (adv.), *illic* (dat.), *opino*, etc., it seems to me to be the duty of an editor of Plautus to warn his readers that although the familiar form (e.g. *opinor*) is offered by the extant MSS., there is no real evidence that the unfamiliar form (e.g. *opino*) did not stand in the immediate original of the MSS. In fact we may be said to be more certain that Plautus used *opino* (examples are in Langen 'Beitraege,' p. 64) than that he used *opinor* (e.g. Bacch. 155). Of course *opinatus sum* no more attests *opinor* than *solutus sum* attests '*soleor*.' Cf. Most. 832 *ludificat* (-tur *A P*) and perhaps Stich. 165 *oboriunt* (-tur *A P*).

and miscopied it as

bonum aequomque rogas.

Totus is similarly the stock explanation of O. Lat. *perpes*; and so *totam* was in some original^f of *A* written above *perpetem* (-*im*) in Truc. 278 :

noctem in stramentis pernoctare perpetim.

The transcriber mistook the suprascript word, not for a correction (as in the line of the *Mostellaria* just quoted), but for an omission, producing in *A* the unmetrical line :

noctem in stramentis pernoctare perpetim totam.

Similarly the Palatine archetype shewed Trin. 350 in this form :

Minus, pater ; sed civi immuni [inmunifico] scis quid cantari
solet ?

Some examples of apparent divergence in *A* and *P*, which may be really due to this cause, have been already mentioned in Part II (pp. 58, 60, 63, 70 sqq.) Among other passages that may be named in this connexion are : Merc. 300 *benest* *A*, *bonum est* *P* ; Pers. 408 *periure* *A*, *iniure* *P* ; Pseud. 43 *impertit* *A*, *mittit* *P* ; 232 *nihil curassis* *A*, *bene curassis* (if miswritten for *ne curassis*) *P* ; 417 *anteveniat* *A*, *antecedat* *P* ; 901 *fortiter* *A*, *firmiter* *P* ; 1142 *ipsus ipsum* *A*, *ipsus coram* *P* ; Stich. 455 *logis* *A*, *meis* *P* ; 523 *ubi* *A*, *si* *P* ; Trin. 1071 *hic* *A*, *ipsus* *P* ; Truc. 261 *in nostra domo* *A*, *nostrae domi* *P* ; 363 *puer* *A*, *mihi* *P*, and perhaps Stich. 167 *auditavi* *A*, *audivi saepe* *P* (cf. Paul. Fest. 28 M. *auditavi*, *saepe audivi*).

Now precisely the same practice of adding suprascript glosses may have occasionally led to a consensus of *A P* in error. In Poen. 1317, for example, *cur* (*gur*) *non*, the reading of *A* and *P*, may not be the original reading of either recension, but may have found its way into *A* and *P* through the suprascription of a gloss over the word in the text, producing the apparently unmetrical line :

gur non adhibuisti, dum istaec loquere, tympanum ?

^f A glance at the apograph of the Palimpsest will shew how inevitable such errors must have been. There is nothing to indicate whether a suprascript

letter is meant as a substitute (e.g. COPIAM Stich. 351) or an addition (e.g. SIRE Mil. 477, CATELLA Mil. 603).

Bothe supposed the original reading to have been *gurne*, in support of which might be quoted the numerous lines in which *nē* is glossed ^g by *non*; Geppert made it *quin*, and this reading might be supported by Pseud. 501, where the Palatine MSS. (*A n.l.*) offer *cur non* but editors print *quin*, and by the Bembine scholiast's explanation of *quinni* as *cur non* in Ter. Eun. 328.

When in Paulus' epitome of Festus' dictionary (51. 5 M.) we read that *custodela* was the O. Lat. form of *custodia*, we understand how it is that our Palatine MSS. offer *custodia* instead of *custodela* in the four lines in which the word occurs (Merc. 233, Most. 406, Rud. 625, 696). None of these lines has been preserved in our Palimpsest fragment; but there would be nothing remarkable in a consensus of *AP* in this form ^h. In a number of the cases mentioned above, where unfamiliar early forms have been modernized in our MSS., e.g. *eveniat* for *evenat*, a suprascript gloss may have been the real agency at work. Cas. 702 is an instructive example of how glosses marred the two texts:

Ut nubat mihi—illud quidem volebam,
Nostro vilico;

for the peculiar phrase *illud quidem volebam*, 'I meant to say,' has brought glosses, but fortunately different glosses, into *A* (*dicere volebam*) and *P* (*volebam sed non*). There was an even chance here of the same gloss being foisted upon the text in both MSS.

Other possibilities of specious, not real, consensus in error are more difficult to determine:—

In Truc. 383:

Quod tu hic me absente novi negoti gesseris?

both scribes have made the same mistake of transposition, but

^g E.g. *nevis* by *nonvis*, *nevult* by *nonvult* (Nonius 144 M.: *nevult* pro *nonvult*). Thus at Trin. 361 *nevult* (P) has become *nonvult* in *A*. Priscian attests *nē* (?*nē*) *viderit* for Mil. 149: *ut quod viderit ne viderit*, but both *A* and the extant minuscule MSS. have *non viderit*.

^h The similarity too of L to I in Capital Script might possibly cause *custodela* to be mistaken for a supposed *custodeia* and altered in the usual fashion (see part IX, below) to *custodia*. I do not know of any sufficient grounds for believing *custodia* to have been an O. Lat. form. It is true that the word *aio* is glossed by *dico* (cf. the Thesaurus Glossarum s.v.); but the substitution of, e.g., *dicebant* for *aiebant* at Men. 1046 in our minuscule MSS. is perhaps more easily explained by the similarity of *a* to *d* in early minuscule script. From *diebant* to *dicebant* was but a step.

fortunately their deviation from their original has taken different directions. *A*'s transposition is *me hic absente*, while *P*'s is *hic absente me*. This suggests the possibility of an occasional coincidence¹ in transposition. In Mil. 727-9:

Sicut merci pretium statuit qui est probus agoranomus :
Quae probast mers, pretium ei statuit, pro virtute ut veneat,
Quae improbast, pro mercis vitio dominum pretio pauperat,

the similarity of the clauses led to omission (but fortunately not the same omission) in *P* (*om.* qui est—statuit) and in *A* (*om.* mers—improbast). Another example will be found in Poen. 389 (*om.* C D) and 390 (*om.* *A*¹). But the most irresistible of all temptations to a scribe was the temptation to Haplography, to write a repeated word or syllable once instead of twice. It would hardly be rash to assert that there is not a repeated word or syllable in a line of Plautus which in some MS. or other has not come to suffer haplography. If Plautus wrote :

Pseud. 443 ὦ Ζεῦ, Ζεῦ, quam pauci estis homines commodi !
Stich. 384 Iam, iam non facio auctionem : mi obtigit hereditas,
Poen. 1272^k Cur, cur numero estis mortui, hoc exemplo ut
pingeretis ?

Poen. 969 Cretast, cretast profecto horum hominum oratio,
Cas. prol. 72 Et hic in nostra terra in terra Apulia,

we have no right to ascribe the haplography in *A* and *P* to a common original of the two MSS. Such a mistake would with the utmost ease be made independently by different scribes.

Of late there has been a tendency to minimize the indications of different origin of *A*^A and *P*^A. Cases of 'mixture' of text have been put forward as a proof that both recensions came from some original

¹ Men. 201 is not a case in point. See above, p. 79. In Most. 1043 *ut filium suum arcesserem* (*A P*) instead of *filium ut* might almost be called an 'inevitable' transposition.

^k This line is quoted by Festus in the same form (at least in our single MS. of Festus) as in the Plautus MSS. Whether Festus deliberately discarded the first word of the line is not clear. In any case this evidence for the retention of final *d* in the Abl. *numerod* (beside *exemplo* !) seems to me very weak indeed. In Cas. 646 our MS. of Festus has (like our minuscule MSS. of Plautus but unlike the Palimpsest) omitted *me* through Haplography in the phrase *mea me ancilla*, a phrase which would be a pitfall for any scribe at any time.

'variorum' edition of the collected plays; an edition crammed with variant readings; and the divergence of the two recensions has been referred to the choice by transcribers, now of the accepted reading, now of the variant. It seems to me that in most cases a much more natural and likely explanation of the 'mixture' is that the reading of one recension came in course of time to be entered in the margin of a copy of the other recension, and from there found its way into the text. In fact we can trace the same process still going on in *A* and in *P* themselves (or their originals). In Pseud. 975 *impium*, the reading of *P*^A, may have been entered in the margin¹ of the original of *A*, whose reading is *impurum*, just as in Pseud. 880 what was a marginal (or interlinear) variant in the original has retained a place, but not its right place, in *A* (*tu illos* *P*^A and *A*-text, *tuos* *A*-margin). In Pseud. 1207 *abduceret*, the reading of *A*^A, is entered in the margin of *P*, whose reading is *arcesseret*, and so on. And yet some advocates of unity of origin for the two recensions go so far as to ascribe certain apparent instances of consensus of *AP* in error to the existence of holes in the pages of this supposed original and to estimate the number of lines which each imaginary page must have contained. This is surely to forget that *A* and *P* are two out of a vast number of ancient copies of Plautus, belonging to different parts of the Roman world, with as little likelihood of being closely related to each other as two copies of Shakespeare, published, let us say, at the interval of a century or half a century, the one at Glasgow and the other at Melbourne. The great argument used by the supporters of such theories is the consensus in error of the two ancient codices. By going through the apparatus criticus of an edition of Plautus and taking note of each and every occurrence where a reading marked '*AP*' has not been printed in the text, they are able to confront us with an imposing list of lines in which the reading of *A* and of *P* is the same and apparently erroneous. The greater part of the examples consists of trivial miswritings, such as we have indicated in the preceding pages. These may be struck off the lists at once, as proving nothing. As regards the remaining examples, we find that year by year the list grows smaller; for,

¹ The *P*^A version is: *legerupam impium peiurum atque improbum*. *A* has: *legirupum inpurum peiurum atque impium*, the marginal variant having ousted *improbum*. But *impium* may have been a marginal correction of *inpurum*.

as our knowledge of Plautine diction and prosody grows, we recognise the correctness of this or that reading supported by the consensus of *A* and *P*. Before 1892, when Prof. Skutsch published the first volume of his *Forschungen*, with its interesting discovery of the suppression (before an initial consonant) of final *ē* in *ille*, *nempe*, *inde*, *proinde*, etc., in Plautus' verse, just as in all literature in *atque* (*ac*), *neque* (*nec*), *neue* (*neu*), lines like Stich. 175:

Quia inde iam á pausillo púero ridiculús fui

used to form a considerable part of these lists. Men. 167 will, I presume, be omitted from them, now that the same scholar has shewn us that *olfactare* has its old pronunciation *oléfactare*:

Súmmum olefactáre oportet.

The whole history of Plautine textual criticism in the last half-century has taught us that truth lies, if anywhere, in the consensus of *A* and *P*, and that the danger in tampering with a reading supported by *A* alone or *P* alone is not nearly so great as the danger of discarding the united testimony of the 'two witnesses.' No judge will arrive at a correct verdict who does not weigh the evidence. The evidence of *AP* must outweigh the single evidence of *P*. The practice of emending lines of Plautus without stating whether the reading which is impugned rests on the authority of *P* only or of *A* only, or of *A* and *P* combined, obscures the conditions of the problem to the reader and encourages the writer to reject genuine readings too hastily.

The whole weight of tradition supports the reading *penitus*^m (in its original sense of 'from within') in Pseud. 132:

atque ípse egreditur pénitus (*intus* edd.), periurí caput.

Are we as much justified in substituting *intus* in this line as we might be in a line for which we had no better evidence than the Carolingian archetype? In Stich. 704, does not the consensus of *AP* in the reading *in lecticis* rather point to some Plautine coinage like *inlectice* (adv.) of the type of *accubuo* (Truc. 422)?

STICH. Nínum lepide in méntem uenit: pótius quam in subséllio

^m *Penitus* is normally an Adj. in Plautus, 'inner;' its adverbial sense, 'within,' is not Plautine. But Comparative Philology shews us that the original sense of the Adverb must have been 'from within.'

Cynice hic accipimur quam inlectice (*in lectis* edd.) SAG. Immo enim nimio hic dulcius.

Must we not retain their reading *stultitiis* in Trin. 509, and give *de* the sense of 'after' or 'in consequence of' (as in Cas. 415, etc.)?

nám is (*sc. ager*) *de stultitiis* (*diuitiis* edd.) meis
solús superfit praéter uitam rélicuos.

Should we disregard their testimony to the old trisyllabic form of *ergo* (as *iurigo* of *iurgo*, *purigo* of *purgo*) in Poen. 1051?

patritus'er <e> go hóspes Antidamás fuit?

Should we ignore their indication of an O. Lat. *fortasse est* like *necesse est* in Poen. 1004-5?

MIL. Fortásse medicos nós esse arbitrárier.

AGOR. Sĭ ést (Si ita est edd.), nega esse: nólo ego errare hóspitem.

And is the phrase *in ius uos uolo* so impossible that we must suppose both *A* and *P* to be in error in Poen. 1225?

quíd istic? quod faciúndumst cur non ágimus? in ius uós uolo (*uoco* edd.).

Certainly, if we consider the number of lines supported by the consensus of *A* and *P*, whose reading has been justified through advance in our knowledge of Plautus, we shall be inclined to predict that nearly every line so supported will prove to be free from error, unless there be an error into which *A* and *P* have fallen independently, like the 'modernizing' of an archaic form, e.g. *ridiculosissimos* for *ridiculissimos* (Stich. 389), Haplography, or some other equally obvious miswriting, such as *illorum* for *Iliorum* (Bacch. 951), *atque euoca* for *atque uoca* (Poen. 1116), *optumi maxumi* for *opt. maxume* (Men. 573), *festiua mulier* for *festiuam mulier* (Mil. 591). But to argue on the other side is much more easy, for one has ready to hand all the apparent instances of consensus in error which have not yet received their explanation; and, although the number available is diminishing steadily, there still remains a sufficient quantity to provide a respectable case. A large list of instances is furnished by lines which shew Hiatus. These, however, lose their force, if we are to believe (and I do not see how we can venture to disbelieve)

Cicero's express statement that the early poets made extensive use of this license. A discussion of the limits within which we may suppose Plautus to have used it I reserve for Part VIII.

Even if real cases of consensus in error, these lines with Hiatus would hardly justify the theory of so close a relation between *A*^A and *P*^A as is assumed. Cicero's contemporaries regarded Hiatus as a feature of Plautine verse, and a 'versus hians' would be accepted without question by all editors of Plautus in Cicero's time as well as later.

And certainly on the face of it it seems likely enough that there would be other mistakes found in all of even the earliest editions (whether of single plays or a collection), like the misprints that were handed down through successive editions of Shakespeare or any other poet. But it must be confessed that it is extremely difficult to get completely satisfactory instances. Take, for example, Epid. 568 (I include the following couplet and the Scene-heading) :

PERIPHANES. Iube Telestidem huc prodire filiam ante aedis
meam,
Ut suam videat matrem. PHILIPPA. Remigrat animus nunc
demum mihi.

(Act IV Sc. ii) ACROPOLISTIS PERIPHANES PHILIPPA
FIDICINA SENEX MVLIER

ACROPOLISTIS. Quid est, pater, quod me excivisti ante aedis?

In this play the 'fidicina' Acropolistis has passed as Periphanes' daughter, under the name Telestis. Her father of course speaks of her as Telestis, while in the Scene-heading and throughout the dialogues she naturally figures as Acropolistis. Both *A* and *P* offer erroneously *Acropolistidem* in v. 568. And yet surely any scribe or corrector would suspect *Telestidem* in this line to be an error, since it is followed by ACROPOLISTIS in the Scene-heading and ACROPOLISTIS (in some contracted form) through the ensuing dialogue. We can hardly venture to assert that *Acropolistidem* stood in the immediate original of *A* or in the Carolingian archetype of the minuscule MSS., much less that it stood in the recensions *A*^A and *P*^A.

Or take Epid. 455 with *centones farcias* for *centones sarcias*. In minuscule script *s* and *f* are so persistently confused that one transcript at least is fairly sure to offer *fors* (or *fuit* or *fit* or *falsus*)

where the original has *sors* (or *suit* or *sit* or *salsus*). We cannot with confidence ascribe *farcias* even to the minuscule archetype. As regards *A* there would not be the same 'inevitableness' of error. But the confusion of similar words, e.g. *capiam* and *copiam*, (see above, p. 107), is so common as to prevent us from referring with any confidence the error to the *A*⁺ recension.

Or take Merc. 598, where it appears as though two lines had been inserted in *A* as well as *P* (but only the beginnings of the lines are legible in *A*) which belong to another part of the play, vv. 842-3 (but the leaves of *A* containing this part have been lost):

Divom atque hominum quae speratrix atque era eadem es
hominibus,

Spem speratam quom obtulisti hanc mihi, tibi grates ago.

It is impossible to say that these lines are out of keeping with the passage at 598 sqq., for Charinus, the speaker, is represented as in a feverish mood, passing at a moment from hope to despair :

Sed isne est quem currentem video ? ipse est, ibo obviam.

Divom atque hominum quae speratrix atque era eadem es
hominibus,

Spem (spes *A*) speratam quom obtulisti hanc mihi, tibi grates
ago.

Nunc, quod restat, ei ! disperii : voltus neutiquam huius
placet :

Tristis incedit,—pectus ardet, haereo,—quassat caput.

Eutyche ! Eu, Charine. Priusquam recipias anhelitum,

Uno verbo eloquere : ubi ego sum ? hicine an apud mortuos ?

If Plautus did not put the couplet at both places^p, then its

^p The recurrence of a sentiment in a drama may be, like the recurrence of a 'leitmotif' in a piece of music, a touch of the composer's art. How effective the exit of Stichus at the end of Act III Scene i is made by the repetition of the same sentiment as had probably brought him a round of applause earlier in the Scene (v. 436) ! Editors of Plautus seem to me to tolerate it when the words are not identical (e.g. Bacch. 498 and 380 ; Men. 810 and 777, 1031 and 1148 ; cf. Langen's *Plautinische Studien*, and Kellermann's recent dissertation), but to condemn it when the line is repeated unchanged. The *Pseudolus* curiously offers four examples of identical recurrence (116=1073, 381=600, 409=788, 485=527), but we have not the evidence of *A* in the case of the last two (as indeed we have not in Merc. 842) to shew us whether the recurrence was a feature of *A* as well as of *P* ? We must not forget Horace's sneer at the 'non astrictus soccus' of Plautus.

insertion (here or later) was probably a feature of the 'Revival' text.

Or take Poen. 474 beginning *volaticorum*. The 'nota personae' prefixed to the line in both texts was E (i.e. Lycus). What was more natural than that *Evolaticorum* should be suggested? This is the reading of the Palatine MSS. in which this form of error is very frequent indeed (see the instances quoted on p. 92 above).

It was not in the original of *A* apparently, but the scribe of *A* momentarily fell into the trap and wrote EVOL—only to correct himself the next moment by expunging the E. The best example^a that I can find of an error shared by *A* and *P* like the misprints shared in early editions of Shakespeare is Poen. 670 :

Immo ut ipse nobis dixit, quo accures magis,
Trecentos nummos Philippos portat *praes ibi* (*prae sibi*),

for one can imagine *praes ibi* to be continued without suspicion in successive transcriptions, and can accept the conjecture *praesidi* with some confidence. And yet caution rather than confidence in departing from the MSS. is the lesson of Plautine textual criticism during the last fifty years. With what confidence did editors of the last generation reject *Chio* (adj.) in Curc. 78 and *cōr* in Poen. 388! But it only needed a full investigation of Plautus' scansion of such final syllables as originally ended in two consonants, e.g. *cor(d)*, *lac(t)*, *miles(s)*, *dives(s)*, to establish once for all the correctness of the manuscript reading. And a single paper by Buecheler in the Rheinisches Museum was enough to confirm^r *Chio* in Curc. 78, Poen. 699, *Pellaëo* in Asin. 333, etc.

^a Those who believe in 'adscript parallel passages' will find a better example in Stich. 282 (cf. Leo ad loc. But see Seyffert in Berl. Phil. Woch. xvi 284.)

^r This field of enquiry is by no means exhausted. A full discussion of the subject would be of great service. The instances adduced by Buecheler of 'vocalis anceps ante vocalem' in Early Latin like Classical *illūs* may probably be multiplied. *Pius*, *pietas* seem likely to be Plautine as well as *pīus*, *pīetas*. Since *proprius* is a compound of *pro* and *privus*, the old scansion must have been *proprius*, and this scansion has strong claims in Capt. 862, &c. Editors who reject *fiat* (Men. 352? Mil. 1054?) and substitute *fuat* can appeal to the Glossaries, which regularly gloss the older verb by the other, and to passages like Pseud. 1029 where *fuant*, retained in the minuscule archetype, became *fiant* in the original of *C* and *D*.

Since the publication of Leo's treatise on the Song-Cantica of Plautus no editor exhibits 'confidence' in departing from the reading of the MSS. in these portions of the plays. A comparison of the Cantica in Leo's edition and in the large Teubner edition will shew the reason of this change of mood.

In fact the whole line of advance in our knowledge of Plautus' text has been steadily in the one direction of the re-establishment of the readings common to *A* and *P*. It may be that criticism has gone as far in this direction as it is destined to go, and that another movement is now necessary; but I must confess that I see no indication of this. Our knowledge of Plautine Accidence and Syntax and Prosody and Metre is still progressive, and success lies in the same direction now as ever. An editor therefore should exercise great caution in departing from the united reading of *AP*, unless there is clear possibility of the two scribes having fallen independently into the same error. For no thoroughly satisfactory evidence has as yet been produced of errors common to the two ancient recensions.

For the sake of completeness I add the more noticeable examples adduced in the most recent list:

Cas. 625 with *factis* for *factu* looks like an example to be set beside Poen. 670.

Poen. 1168

Sed eccas video ipsas. Haecine meae sunt filiae?

Quantae e quantillis iam sunt factae? Scin quid est?

Thraecae sunt: in celonem (*sunt celumne* P) sustolli solent.

There seems no reason for re-writing the last line. It is preserved correctly by *A*. The preposition has the sense of 'like,' 'after the manner of.'

Mil. 1419 Di tibi bene faciant semper, quom advocatus mihi bene's (*mihi benest A, bene mihi es P*).

This reading, presumably common to the two recensions, should not be altered (see Seyffert in Berl. Phil. Woch., xvi, 234).

Stich. 620 Tantillum loculi ubi catellus cubet, id mi sat e rest loci (res est *ut vid A*).

The same remark applies to this line (cf. Seyffert *ibid.*).

Poen. 331

primum prima salva sis,
Et secunda tu insecundo salve in pretio ; tertia
Salve extra pretium.

Insecundo (cf. Auct. ad Herenn. IV. 56) may be Gerundive of *insequor* as *secundo* of *sequor*.

Cas. 571 Rogitare oportet prius et contari.

Prius, the original scansion of the word, seems to be found elsewhere in Plautus (Cas. 839, Bacch. 932, etc.). *Percontor* presupposes the simple verb *contor*, lit. 'to use a punt-pole,' hence 'to make enquiry.'

Stich. 223 (in the parasite's imaginary auction).

Adeste sultis, praeda erit praesentium,
Logos ridiculos vendo, áge licemini.
Qui cena poscit ? ecqui poscit prandio ?
(Hercules te amabit)—prandio, cena tibi.
Ehem, adnuistin ? etc.

Hercules te amabit is a most natural parenthetical exclamation to a supposed bidder. Of course the dactyl in the first foot of the line is perfectly normal.

Stich. 243 The exclamation *eu ecastor* seems to be 'extra metrum,' like *attat* in Cas. 619, &c., &c.

Pseud. 306 Non est iustus quisquam amator nisi qui perpetuat data.

Iustus amator, 'a normal lover,' 'a lover worthy of the name,' seems perfectly correct.

Pseud. 442 Idne tu mirare, si patrissat filius ?

Idne tu, whether it should be scanned *idné tú* or *idn' tú*, need not be altered.

Mil. 254 vera ut esse credat quae mentibitur.

The corrector of *B* writes *mentibimur*. But I think we have here an O. Lat. construction, the Accusative with the Impersonal Passive (see above, pp. 10, 49).

Of the rest some readily admit of emendation by the removal of one 'inevitable' error, e.g. Most. 586:

Reddetur ne igitur faenus? Reddet (-tur A P), nunc abi,

while in others there is a choice between two possible errors of this type:

e.g. Most. 984, where it is doubtful whether *quaesitum* has become *quaestum* or *pote siet* has become *potesit*; or Stich. 357, where some print *nisi . . venturi si sunt* (si om. A P), others *lectos insternite* (st. A P).

Others again still await satisfactory emendation:

e.g. Pseud. 627 (a trochaic Septenarius):

Ballionis curo, argentum accepto, expenso et quoi debet dato.

Should a 'pet-form' (e.g. *Balli*) replace *Ballionis*, as in Most. 560 *Tranium* is employed for the usual *Tranionem*? Or has there been 'mixture' of two versions (1) *accepto et quoi debet dato*, (2) *accepto, expenso et dato*? If so, I would conjecture that the second is the 'genuine' version and was the reading of A⁴, while the first is the 'Revival' version.

(VIII.) *Hiatus*^a.

Before the time of Ritschl most editors of Plautus felt themselves bound to accept almost every instance of Hiatus that was forced upon them by the consensus of the then available MSS. In all the MSS., for example, Trin. 18, an Iambic Senarius, appeared in this form:

huic nomen Graece est Thensauo fabulae,

with hiatus between *Graece* and *est*; the second hemistich of Pseud. 375, a trochaic Septenarius, in this form:

facere officium meum,

^a A full collection of all conceivable instances in Plautus will be found in Maurenbrecher 'Hiatus und Verschleifung,' a book, however, which must be called 'something between a hindrance and a help': a help, because the collection is full, a hindrance, because it is indiscriminate. Why should a mere scribal error, which would be recognised as such in any other line, be added to the list of 'Instances of Hiatus presented by the Traditional Text,' if it occurs in a line in which one word ends in a vowel or *m* and the next begins with a vowel or *h*?

with hiatus between *facere* and *officium*. And the acceptance of these 'versus hiantes' was justified by an appeal to Cicero's words in the *Orator* (XLV 152): *sed Graeci viderint; nobis, ne si cupiamus quidem, distrahere voces conceditur. Indicant orationes illae ipsae horridulae Catonis, indicant omnes poetae praeter eos qui, ut verum facerent (i.e. 'through metrical exigencies'), saepe hiabant, ut Naevius:*

uos, quí | accolitis Hístrum fluuium atque álgidam,

et ibidem:

quam númquam uobis Grafi | atque bárbari,

at Ennius semel (saepe *edd.*):

Scipiö | inuicte,

et quidem nos:

hoc motu radiantis Etesiaë | in vada ponti.

Hoc idem nostri saepius non tulissent, quod Graeci laudare etiam solent.

Ritschl's production of the evidence of the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*) changed the aspect of the case. It was found that the consensus of the MSS. in these two lines, and in others of the kind, was merely the result of their derivation from a common archetype (*P*), a MS. probably of Charlemagne's time or later. The scribe of this minuscule archetype (or its original) had transposed the words *nomen* and *Graece* in Trin. 18 and had omitted the Pronoun *me* in Pseud. 375. In the fourth-century Palimpsest, which precedes, *P* in age by many centuries, these lines appear in their true form:

huic Graéce nomen ést Thensauro fábulae,

and

fácere me officiúm meum.

Now transposition of words is one of the commonest errors of scribes; and the omission of small words, especially such as are not necessary to the sense of the sentence, is an error to which scribes of Plautus' Comedies are peculiarly liable, for this comedian delights in the otiose use of Pronouns (*ego, tu, hic*, etc.), Particles (*pol, quí*, etc.), and the like. How then is an editor to decide in the numerous passages for which the evidence of the fragmentary Palimpsest is not available, whether a 'versus hians' retains the

correct version of Plautus or owes its abnormal form to a mere scribal error? This is the most difficult of all the problems which an editor of Plautus has to face; and it is one of constant occurrence, for in the Palimpsest the whole of the *Amphitruo*, *Asinaria*, *Aulularia* and *Curculio* is missing, nearly the whole of the *Captivi* (and *Vidularia*), and a great part of the other plays; the best preserved are the *Stichus*, *Persa*, *Poenulus*, *Pseudolus* and *Trinummus*. For the greater part of the plays we have only the evidence of the minuscule Palatine archetype to appeal to, save that lines here and there are preserved in quotations by ancient Grammarians, such as Nonius, Festus, Charisius, Priscian.

That Hiatus was a feature of the older poetry is a fact which cannot be denied. Cicero's^t statement (*ut versum facerent, saepe hiabant*) is conclusive on this point; and it is supported by the evidence (so far as that goes) of Saturnian Verse, in which any final long vowel or final syllable in *-m* seems normally to remain unelided before an initial vowel. Thus *uirginem oraret* and *aut ibi ommentans* seem to be six-syllabled hemistichs of the same type as *Naeuius poetae* (for details see Amer. Journ. Phil. xiv 309). And we have Hiatus expressly attested by Priscian in a couplet of Ennius (Ann. 332 V., 354 M.):

insignita fere tum milia militū | octo
duxit delectos, bellum superare potentes.

Saturnian versification transmitted to the early Latin adaptations of Greek Metre not merely its use of Alliteration and something of its regard for Accent, but also, in greater or less degree, its tolerance of Hiatus. Ritschl's uncompromising attitude of hostility to Hiatus is now given up by all editors of Plautus. No one now believes that Plautus, while readily admitting Elision at the end of the first hemistich of long lines, did not also readily admit Hiatus. Lines like :

Men. 778 nescio quid uos uelitati | estis inter uos duos,
Amph. 208 redūcturum, abiturós agro | Argíuos, pacem atque
ótium,
Mil. 1226 namque édepol uix fuit cópiā | adeúndi atque
impetrándi,

^t Presumably not originated by Cicero, but rather the common verdict of literary antiquarians of that time.

are no longer tampered with by editors; for it is acknowledged that the pause that followed the utterance of the first half of these lines justifies Hiatus, in the same way that it justifies the lengthening of a short syllable in lines like Mil. 1226 (just quoted),

Asin. 634 quas hódie adulescens Díabolūs ipsí daturus díxit.

At the same time no two editors are agreed upon the exact limits observed by Plautus in his tolerance of Hiatus, upon the precise extent to which Cicero's statement, *ut versum faceret, hiabat*, applies to this early poet, the earliest whose works have, in any measure of completeness, been preserved.

It is clear that in the investigation of this subject we must be careful in the selection of our material. We must confine ourselves, for the first at least, to lines whose text depends on something better than the evidence of one archetype. It is useless to compile lists of instances of Hiatus which have no stronger evidence than the Carolingian archetype of the Palatine MSS.; what assurance have we that they are not all of the same type as the examples quoted above, *Graece | est* and *facere | officium*, and that the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*), if we could discover or decipher its version of the lines, would not present them in a different and more correct form^u? Lines which are supported by the evidence of both *P* and *A*, or of *P* and some ancient Grammarian, have far stronger claims to our credence. They are likely to be either the 'ipsa verba' of Plautus, or at least the version that passed current as such in the early centuries of our era.

The method therefore that I propose to follow is this, to use as material only those 'versus hiantes' whose text is strongly established and to examine how many of the types of Hiatus which they exhibit are justified from later poetry, whether by its occasional use of the same licence or by its patent avoidance of Elision in such cases. For I take it that Latin Poetry flowed in a continuous stream from Livius Andronicus to Virgil, and that the prosody of one generation was never wholly alien from that of the generation that preceded it. When we find Catullus (xcvii 1)

^u For example, one of the lines used as evidence that Hiatus was permissible before initial *h* is Rud. 11 :

qui fácta | hominum, móres, pietatem ét fidem (*P A n.l.*),

where, it now appears, the Codex Turnebi had *moresque*.

and Virgil (*Ecl.* viii 108) admitting *ita me dī ament* and *an quī amant*, we cannot disconnect these scansiones from the forms in which these phrases normally (not occasionally) appear in Plautus, e.g. :

Trin. 242 nam quī amat quod amat, etc.,

Cist. 280 nam quī amant stulte atque inmodeste atque inprobe,

Merc. 744 nam quī amat quod amat, etc.

Curc. 142 (anapaestic) Palinúre. Edepol quī amát, sí eget, etc.

Pseud. 943 (anapaestic) Ita mé dī ament—Ita nón facient, etc.

With Plautus' lines before us we can no longer regard the hiatus of *dī*, *quī* in these phrases in Catullus' and Virgil's lines as a mere artificial imitation of Greek metrical licences, like *Actaeo* | *Aracyntho*. Clearly the phrases were pronounced by Roman lips in this way; and the Early Dramatists, who aim at the reproduction of the language of actual, everyday life, felt no scruples in giving them this scansion in their verse.

The Prosodic Hiatus of monosyllables ending in a long vowel or *m* persists so determinedly in Republican poetry and even in the more colloquial part of Horace's writings (the *Satires* and *Epistles*), that Ritschl himself was forced to allow it a place in Plautus. Its exact limits in Plautine Verse are not easy to define*. On the one hand we see a clear tendency to avoid by this means the total absorption by Elision of an emphatic monosyllable, e.g.

Tú | erus es, tu séruom quaere, tú salueto, tú uale.

On the other, we see Enclitics or subordinate words joined with a neighbouring word into a word-group and thus avoiding elision, e.g. *quī-amant*, *quī-homo* like *dēamant*, etc. More questioned is the Prosodic Hiatus with Iambic and Cretic words, as in Virgil's *vale*, *valē*, | *inquit* (cf. Ovid *Met.* iii 501), and *insulaē* | *Ionio in magno*, Lucretius' *remigē* | *oblitae pennarum*, Catullus' *uno in lectulō*, | *erudituli ambo* (v.l. *lecticulo*), Ennius' *Scipiō* | *invicte*, and *milia militū* | *octo* (see above); for many scholars believe these to be imitations of Greek scansiones like ἔσσεται ἥμαρ (pronounced, according to Blass,

* That the unelided monosyllable occasionally constitutes one 'mora,' e.g. *dē hórdeo* (Asin. 706, *P*, *Nonius*) like *quāmbrem*, *dēhórtor*, *ē hác* (Pseud. 1331, *A P*), is now generally admitted; but the matter has not yet been thoroughly investigated. The change of *me*, *te* in Hiatus of this kind to *med*, *ted* may not be invariably a necessity.

ἔσσετα-γ-ῆμαρ). At the same time it is well known that the elision of the final vowel of an Iambic or Cretic word is avoided in Latin Poetry; and this fact suggests that there was something in the actual Latin pronunciation that operated against the suppression of the final long vowel or (the equivalent of a long vowel) the vowel followed by *-m* in such a collocation of syllables. The rarity of elision of the last syllable of *quidem*, for example (see Munro's note on Lucr. iii 904), lends credence to the traditional text of Ennius *Ann.* 494 V. (322 M.):

dum quidēm | unus homo Romanu' toga superescit.

A very strongly attested instance of this kind in Plautus, attested by both *P* and *A* and by an ancient Grammarian also, is:

Pseud. 319 úna opera alligém fugitiuam cánēm | agninis láctibus
(*A P*, *Nonius*),

and similarly:

Stich. 152 síquae forte ex Ásia nauis hérĭ | aut hodie uénerit
(*A P*),

Pseud. 317 aút terra aut marĭ | alicunde, etc. (*A P*),

Pers. 537 méa quidem istuc nil refert, | tuá ego hoc facio grátia
(*A P*),

Poen. 497 Certúm. Tum tu ígitur die bonó | Aphrodísiis (*A P*),

Bacch. 51 dúaě | unum expetítis palumbem, etc. (*P*, *Nonius*),

Merc. 257 naueni éx Rhodo qua est hérĭ | aduectus fílius (*A P*).

while for Cretic words we have lines like:

Most. 675 atque éuocă | aliquem íntus ad te, Tránio (*A P*),

Pseud. 1121 (anapaestic) atque áliquem euocēm | hinc íntus
(*A P*).

Bacch. 134 ibidem égo meam operam pérdidĭ, | ubi tú tuam
(*P*, *Charisius*),

Poen. 988 pro dí immortales, plúrimĭ | ad illúm modum (*A P*),

Pseud. 346 quíndecĭm | habeó minas (*A P*).

The incidence of the ictus, be it remarked, cannot have had anything to do with the scansion. If Plautus pronounced the phrase as *evocă aliquem* (or *hinc*) *intus*, he would scan it after this fashion, whether the ictus or beat of the verse fell on the first or second or third syllable of the word *evoca*. I can see no justification for the widely prevalent opinion that Plautine Prosody

is in great measure controlled by the incidence of ictus, by the fall, in other words, of the baton of a conductor marking the time (*pollicis ictus*, Horace). Surely the prosody of a word, the quantity and articulation of a syllable, must have been controlled by the pronunciation of the word in the phrase or sentence, and not by anything else whatever. If the phrase *vale ait* was pronounced by Roman lips *va-lě-a-it*, Plautus could employ it as an opening for an Iambic line, with ictus *valě ait*, as well as for a Trochaic line, with ictus *válě ait*. The exact conditions, apart from mere metrical exigencies, under which Plautus uses Hiatus with Iambic and Cretic words (and word-endings) are difficult to determine. It seems to me that an emphatic disyllable, like *tuo* in such a line as Asin. 147 :

túŕ facit iussu, túŕ | imperio páret, etc.,

is treated like emphatic *tu* in the line quoted above (Men. 1076) :

tŭ|erus es, tu séruom quaere, etc.

But since a full collection of the instances of this type of Hiatus can be found in Klotz *Altrömische Metrik*, pp. 119 sqq., it is unnecessary to say more about it here. Nor need I do more than mention another kind of Hiatus, viz. Hiatus with Interjections (including *eccum*) ; for this remained as fully in use in classical, as in Plautine verse. And other two types of Hiatus, viz. (1) at the Diaeresis of long lines, (2) at a change of speaker, are now admitted by all editors to be unmistakable Plautine usages. Ritschl's argument that the frequency of Elision under the same circumstances is incompatible with Hiatus is now universally abandoned. Without further delay on familiar ground let us push our investigations further a-field, using the clue already indicated, the appearances of Hiatus in post-Plautine poetry. An unmistakable occasion of Hiatus in the classical poetry is the pause between the two clauses of an Antithesis, as in Virgil *G.* i 3 :

qui cultus habendo
sit pecori, | apibus quanta experientia parcis.

Under this heading we may bring the following well-attested line of Plautus :

Men. 882 lumbí sedendo, | óculi spectandó dolent (*P*, *Ausonius*).

We have a similar pause, accompanied by Hiatus in classical poetry, between other separate clauses of a sentence, e.g. Virgil *Ecl.* ii 53, *Aen.* i 405, i 16 :

addam cerea pruna : | honos erit huic quoque pomo,
et uera incessu patuit dea. | Ille ubi matrem,
posthabita coluisse Samo ; | hic illius arma,

to which we may perhaps add some instances of Hiatus in the penthemimeral Caesura like *Ecl.* x 13, viii 41 :

illum etiam lauri, | etiam fleuere myricae,
ut uidi, ut perii, | ut me malus abstulit error.

Similarly in Plautus :

Stich. 270 sed éccum Pinacium, éius puerum. | hóc uide (*A P*),
Poen. 1009 quid in hánc uenistis úrbem ? | aut quid quaéritis ? (*A P*),

Most. 976 sít profectus pégre, perpotásse assiduo. | ác simul (*A P*:—*avisse* Skutsch),

Merc. 259 inscéndo in lembum, | áque ad nauem déuehor (*A P*),

Poen. 1113 specié uenusta, | óre atque oculis pérnigris (*A P Gellius*),

Men. 476 prandí, potaui, scórtum accubui, | ábstuli (*A P*),

Pseud. 673 híc argentum, | híc amica amánti erili fílio (*A P*),

Pers. 413 tene sís argentum : | étiam tu argentúm tenes ? (*A P*) (*tené sis* is unlikely),

Poen. 685 blande hóminem compellábo. | hospes hóspitem
salútat : saluom te áduenire gaúdeo (*A P*),

Pseud. 890 em illíc ego habito. | íntro abi et cenám coque (*A P*),

Bacch. 946 milés Menelaust, égo Agamemno, | ídem Ulixes
Lártius (*A P*) (agamennon *B*),

Merc. 538 Etiám cum uxore nón cubet ? Amábo, | an marítust ? (*A P*),

Stich. 221 logós ridiculos uéndo. | age licémini (*A P*),

Trin. 185 em méa malefacta, | ém meam auaritiám tibi (*A P*)
(meám ? cf. also *Philologus* lix 500).

Trin. 48 o amíce salve, | átque aequalis. út uales? (*A P*),

Most. 583 immo ábi domum, uerum hércle dico, | ábi modo (*A P*)
(*ābī mōdō* is unlikely),

Cas. 782 nam nóuom maritum, | ét nouam nuptám uolo (*A P*),

Pers. 696 eum ego út requiram, | átque uti redimám uolo (*A P*),

Bacch. 495 Sérua tibi sodálem, | et mihi fílium. Factúm uolo
(*A P*),

Merc. 530 ego té redemi : | ille mecum oráuit, etc. (*A P*).

A short vowel is allowed to stand in this hiatus in classical poetry, and a long vowel to retain its length. We may therefore accept

Cas. 550 Própter operam illíus hirci, ímprobi, | edéntuli (*A P*).

The justification of all these examples of Hiatus is to be found in the pause that ensued after the word whose final vowel is left unelided. Just as the inevitable pause at the end of a line prevents elision of a final vowel when the following line begins with a vowel, so in a minor degree the pause after *redemi* in the line just quoted :

ego té redemi : | ille mecum oráuit, etc. ;

and we may say that the hiatus is designed by the poet to indicate that these lines are to be pronounced with a pause after these words^v. We seem to have the same justification of Hiatus in this line of Virgil (*Aen.* iii 606) :

Si pereó, | hominum manibus periisse iuvabit,

where the emphatic articulation of the strongly stressed first syllable of *hominum* would require a momentary rest after the word *pereó* (cf. *Aen.* iv 235). With this line of Virgil I would associate these well-attested examples of Hiatus in Plautus :

Poen. 89 Praesénti argento | hómini, si leno ést homo (*A P*,
Priscian),

Poen. 474 Voláticorum | hóminum? Ita dicó quidem (*A P*).

^v The recently discovered fragment of Menander's *Περικειρομένη* has hiatus at a pause :

αὔριον ἀφήσω, Δωρί. ἀλλ' ὃ δέει λέγειν
ἄκουσον

(Cf. Most. 1032, a line for which we have the evidence of the Palatine MSS. only :

Turbáuit? Immo | éxturbauit ómnia.)

Klotz in his account of Early Roman Metre (Altrömische Metrik, pp. 108 sqq.) claims that the utterance of any Proper Name, at least any unfamiliar name, would be attended by a pause of this kind and accepts as cases of legitimate Hiatus lines like :

Bacch. 354 senéx in Ephesum | íbit aurum arcéssere (*P, A n.l.* ; <hinc> íbit *Camerarius*).

He appeals to Horace (Epod. v. 100) :

et Esquilinaë | alites,

where others find a mere imitation of the Greek Prosodic Hiatus with -*ai* (see above).

I find it difficult to believe in a pause of this sort, unless the name were specially emphasized, e.g.:

Poen. 443

nam istí quidem hercle orátioni | Oédipo
opust cóniectore (*A P, Priscian*);

although an equally strongly attested case is :

Amph. 275 Néc Ingulae neque Vésperugo néque Vergiliae | óccidunt (*P, Varro, Festus*).

A pause would be natural in some lines with the Vocative of a Proper Name or the like, e.g. :

Poen. 1127 O mí ere, salve, | Hánno insperatíssime (*A P*),

Pers. 617 Vírgo, | hic homo próbus est. Credo. Nón diu apud hunc séruies (*A P*).

It is clear that the admission of this principle that any kind of pause in the utterance of a line justified Hiatus opens the way to a great deal of absurdity. One editor² may retain Hiatus in

² In Rud. 526 sqq. Seyffert has ingeniously explained (or rather removed) Hiatus by supposing the speakers, who have just come out of the water, to split up their syllables in chattering fashion :

Nam omnia corusca prae tremore fabulor.

Edepol, Neptune, es balineator frigidus :

one line, another in another line, by managing to persuade themselves or their readers that some pause or other would be found in the actor's articulation of the line. Almost any example of Hiatus might be defended by more or less fantastic reasoning of this kind. And yet, if we believe that Hiatus was as much the rule in Saturnian Poetry as it is the exception in classical verse, we must suppose it to have played a considerable part in the Early Drama. I think the balance of probability is in favour of the correctness of well-attested lines like :

Stich. 216 Consénui, paene súm fame | emórtuos (*A P*),

Stich. 489 Scis tú med esse | únisubsellí uirum (*A P*),

Merc. 312 Lysímache, auctor sum ut méd amando | énicas (*A P*),

Pseud. 44 Lacrumáns, titubanti | ánimo, corde et péctore (*A P*),

Pseud. 349 I gladium adfer : Quíd opus gladio? Quí hunc occidam | átque me (*A P*),

Poen. 694

Ego íd quaero hospitium, úbi ego curer móllius

Quam régi Antiocho | óculi curarí solent (*A P*),

Poen. 1290 Íta replebo, | Átritrate atrítior multo út siet (*A P*),

Pseud. 424

quo in cómmeatum uólui | argentárium

proficísci, ibi nunc óppido opsaeptást uia (*A P*),

Aul. 703 nám istos reges céteros

memoráre nolo, | hómínium mendicábula (*P*, *Nonius*),

Stich. 180 proptérea credo núnc esurio | ácrius (*A P*) (*adesurio Ritschl*, <eo> a. *Mueller*),

Pers. 556 quárta inuidia, quínta ambitio, séxta | obtrectatio (*A P*),

Cum vestimentis, postquam abs te abii, al-algeo (ted ab. al. *edd.*)

Ne thermipolium quidem ullum in-instruit, etc. (nullum *edd.*).

In Asin. 755 sqq. the Parasite adds a clause to a contract and reads it aloud :

PA. Addone? DI. Adde, et scribas vide plane et probe.

PA. 'Alienum | hominem | intro mittat neminem.

Quod illa aut amicum | aut patronum nomet, etc.

That the Hiatus here is not merely a possible but a necessary consequence of writing down the additional words in the presence of the audience, will, I fancy, be denied only by those who have never seen a play acted. Neither for the Rudens-passage nor for this one have we the evidence of the Palimpsest.

where in an English printed play a dash would indicate the pause before the bizarre or *recherché* expression. For I believe that the law of Elision did not press so heavily on the Early Dramatists as on the classical poets, and that the former thought only of avoiding any scansion inconsistent with the actual pronunciation. The actual pronunciation of a word like *voluptatem* was as near *vol-ŭptatem* as *volŭptatem*. Plautus accordingly allows either scansion, whereas the classical poets follow the law of 'length by position' and scan only *volŭptatem*. Similarly the actual pronunciation of *Vergiliae occidunt* was probably as near *Vergiliaē occidunt* as *Vergili(ae) occidunt*, and Plautus accordingly tolerates Prosodic Hiatus in such a phrase along with Elision. Where a phrase had one and only one pronunciation in current utterance, Plautus allows (in his dialogue metres, at least) only the scansion that corresponds to this. Thus while he admits *volŭptatem*, *volō*, he recognises only *volŭptas-mea*, *volō-scire*. He similarly restricts himself to Hiatus in the phrase *flagitium-hominis*, clearly because that scansion was postulated by current pronunciation, while he allows Elision or Hiatus in *intro-ibo*, *circum-imus* and the like. Spelling often indicates to us the course taken by Latin Pronunciation with regard to Elision and Hiatus. We find Elision in *anim(um)adverto*, *magn(o)opere*, *tant(o)opere*, *circitor*, but Prosodic Hiatus in *circu(m)it*, *factu(m)iri*, etc. The pun on *domum-itionem* and *Domitium* (Auct. Herenn. iii 21) indicates Elision; so does the spelling *domusio* (for *domi-usio*, 'home use,' Petron.). Latin pronunciation thus appears to have recognised now Elision, now Prosodic Hiatus with long vowels or syllables in *-m*, while short vowels are invariably elided, e.g. *suav(e)olens*, *sesqu(i)opus*, *sem(i)esus* (on *triennium*, etc., see Brugmann's *Grundriss*). We are accordingly prepared to find a corresponding variety of treatment^a in Plautine versification. But whether we can or should hope to determine in each case the conditions of Hiatus and of Elision is a matter of doubt. Cicero's words *qui, ut versum facerent, saepe hiabant*, would rather

^a 'Where are you?' is in Plautus either *ŭbi tu's?* or *ŭbi tu es?* (cf. Leo ad Cas. 963). Contrast, e.g., *n(am) id est* Ter. Hec. 696 with *nam | ego huc* (anapaest) Plaut. Truc. 113; *m(i) homo* Pers. 620 with the usual *mi | homo* (anap.); *r(em) agis* Men. 685, 898 with the usual *rem | agis* (tribr.) Also *manu | emitto*, e.g. Curc. 497 Aliénos manu emittitis, with *man(u) emitto*, e.g.

Pers. 483 *Dí dent quae velis. Eho! an iam manu émisisti múlierem?* (unless we should here read *emistí*).

lead us to regard Hiatus, at least in its less familiar types, as an occasional, irregular licence, resorted to merely through metrical necessity.

Nævius, unless we are to throw undeserved discredit on Cicero's express statement, left *qui* in Hiatus (not Prosodic Hiatus) in the phrase *vos qui*. But this is certainly not the normal treatment of the phrase. It is a licence of which the poet avails himself in this particular line and would inevitably be 'emended' by a modern editor, unless Cicero's authority stood in the way. Unfortunately we cannot attach the same weight to the consensus of *P* and *A* as to an express declaration by an ancient author like Cicero, for it is patent that these two authorities occasionally have fallen into one and the same error. A very common error in texts of Plautus is the 'modernizing' of unfamiliar, archaic forms, the substitution of *ut* for *uti*, *istum*, *illum* for *istunc*, *illunc*, and so on. The scribe of *A* and the scribe of *P*, or some archetype of *P*, have both committed the mistake of 'modernizing' *uti* in Stich. 234, Pers. 685, &c.:

utí decimam partem Hérculi pollúceam,
crumínam hanc emere aut fácere uti remigrét domum,

istunc, *illunc* in Poen. 651, 1302, Pers. 738, &c.:

atque ístunc e nauí éxeuntem onerária,
iám hercle ego illunc éxcruciandum tótum carnificí dabo,
nisi égo illunc hominem pérdo, perii, atque óptume

(so *illi* for *illic*, Cas. 666, ? Truc. 200, *posse* for *potesse*, Pseud. 26, *sit* for *siet*, ? Men. 519).

Mistakes like these and the others mentioned in the last paragraph (part VII) afford no evidence whatsoever of relationship between MSS. that exhibit them. They belong to the class of 'inevitable' mistakes, into which any scribe at any moment is likely to fall. The appearance of Hiatus which they impose on the line is illusory.

Sies has become *sis* (Men. 110) in *P*, in the MSS. of Servius and in the MSS. of Donatus; and the MS. of Festus, the MSS. of Nonius and the Ambrosian Palimpsest have, each of them, altered *expurigabo* to *expurgabo* in Cist. 304:

expúrigabo hercle ómnia ad raucám rauim (*P n. l.*).

Moreover it is quite possible that *A* and *P* perpetuate some errors

which had crept into some very early recension of Plautus, from which they both are ultimately derived, although it is not likely that these errors would be very numerous (see above, p. 113).

In reading the list, which I now furnish, of the remaining 'versus hiantes' supported by the consensus of *A P*, it must be remembered that there are four possibilities for each instance: (1) the text may be erroneous, the error belonging either to the ancient 'accepted text' of Plautus, or (2) having been inserted separately by the scribe of *A* and the scribe of *P* or of some archetype of *P*, (3) the text may be correct but the hiatus may be apparent and not real, (4) the hiatus may be legitimate.

Bacch. 558 nequám | hominis ego páruí pendo grátiam (? *nequám-homo*, a word-group like *flagitiūm-hominis*),

Bacch. 530 réddidi patrí | omne aurum. núnc ego illam mé uelim (*om. ego A*; *reddidit* or *reddidit A*),

Cas. 126 post áutem ruri, nísi tu acervom | éderis (perhaps *acervom*, 4 syll.),

Cas. 564 hominém | amatorem ullum ád forum procédere (? *hominém-amatorem*, a word-group),

Cas. 1004 MYRRHINA. Cénseo ecastor ueniam hanc dandam. CLEOSTRATA. Faciam út iubes (perhaps *dandam*, *Cleostrata. Faciam*),

Epid. 214 óbuiam ornatae óccurrebant súis quaeque | amatoribus (perhaps *quaequæ am.*),

Men. 223 nám parasitus ócto | hominum múnus facile fúngitur (so also Nonius) (<*unus*> *munus* Mueller),

Men. 1151 quóniam haec euenérunt, frater, nóstra | ex senténtia. (*nostra*, frater *Gruterus*),

Mil. 4 praestríngat oculorum áciem | in acie hóstibus,

Mil. 604 quíppe | hi si résciuere inimíci consiliúm tuom (*om. hi P*: perhaps *quíppe qui*),

Mil. 1136 una éxeuntis uídeo | hinc e próxímo (*uid. ex. Acidalius*: *hinc <huc>* Mueller: perhaps *uideon*),

Pers. 262 nám hoc argentum | álibi abutar: bóues, quos emerem, nón erant (*abutar al. Guyet. Perhaps aliubi ab.*),

Poen. 1130 GIDD. cognóscin Giddenénem, | ancillám tuam? (perhaps <*me*> *anc.*),

Poen. 862 Quid agis? Facio quód manifesti móechi | hau fermé solent (*moechi <hic>* Bothe),

Poen. 969 (see above, p. 109).

Poen. 328 námque edepol lucrúm | amare nállum amatorem áddacet,

Poen. 1295 própemodum | hoc ópsonare prándium poteró mihi,

Poen. 1246 quoqué modo | huius filias apud uós habeatis séruas
(the normal scansion is *apúd uos*),

Poen. 1272 (see above, p. 109).

Poen. 982 adibo | hosce atque áppellabo Púnice (perhaps *adibon*),

Poen. 1327 siquíd lenoni | óbtigit magní mali (siquidem *P*;
siquidem quid *Camerarius*),

Poen. 448 me oboédientem | ésse seruo líberum (ob. me *Bothe*),

Poen. 782 idque ín istoc adeo | aúrum inest marsúppio,

Poen. 1051 patrítus ergo | hósper Antidamás fuit (*patri tuus* ut
vid. *P*; perhaps *erego*, the old form of the conjunction),

Pseud. 151 nempe íta animati | éstis uos : uíncitis duritia hoc
átque me (*uin. hoc dur. ergo a. m. P*),

Pseud. 443 (see above, p. 109),

Pseud. 897 patér Calidori, | ópere edixit máxumo (*fecit P*),

Pseud. 410 erum éccum uideo | húc Simonem uná simul,

Pseud. 153 huc ádhibete auris quae égo loquar, plagígera
genera | hóminum (plagígigerula *Bothe*),

Stich. 171 nunc sí ridiculum | hóminem quaerat quíspiam (? *ridiculũm-hominem*, a word-group like *flagitiũm-hominis*),

Stich. 235 ecástor auctiónem | haud magní preti,

Stich. 477 Nescío quid uero | hábeo in mundo. Í modo,

Stich. 344 iámdudum | ego ístum patior dícere iniusté mihi
(perhaps *iamdudumne*),

Stich. 384 iám non facio | aúctionem : mi óbtigit heréditas
(perhaps *iam* <*iam*>),

Stich. 374 árgenti | auríque aduexit nímium. Nimis factúm bene
(adv. multum *P*),

Trin. 539 nam fúlguritae súnt alternae | árbores (alternas,
alternis edd.),

Trin. 540 sués moriuntur ángina | acérrume (*macerrumae*
Onions).

To these may be added this instance of consensus of *P* with a Grammarian in a Trochaic Septenarius :

Pseud. 762 áui sinistra (-tera?), auspicio liquido atque ex sententia (*P*, *Nonius*),

The following instances look suspiciously like errors inherited both by *P* and by *A* from a common original, the ancient 'accepted text' of Plautus :

Poen. 453 sqq. (the 'leno' is relating his experiences)

sex ímmolauí | ágnos, nec potuí tamen
propítiam Venerem fácere uti | essét mihi (ut *A*)
quoniám litare néqueo, abii illim flico (abi *A P*)
irátus, uotui | éxta prosicárier,

Stich. 459 sqq. (the parasite's relation)

auspício | hodie | óptumo exiui foras :
mustéla murem | ábstulit praetér pedes ;
cum stréna | obscaeuáuit ; spectatum hóc mihist.

Poen. 485 sqq. (the soldier's relation)

tam crébri ad terram | áccidebant quám pira.
ut quisque acciderat, éum necabam | flico
per cérebrum pinna suá sibi quasi túrturem ;

but it is certainly remarkable that all three are narrative passages of the same type.

Quintilian's account of tolerable and intolerable Hiatus in prose Oratory^b can hardly throw much light on the conditions of Hiatus in Plautine verse. Dr. Maurenbrecher has arranged his lists on the theory that Plautus' acceptance and avoidance of Hiatus depended on the nature of the final syllable left unelided. An examination of these lists will, I think, convince us that Plautus makes no distinction between one final long vowel and another, or between a final long vowel on the one hand and a final syllable ending in *-m* on the other. He leaves *virum* in hiatus as readily as *viro*, and *viro* as readily as *vir*. The theory that final

^b Tum vocalium concursus, qui cum accidit, hiat et intersistit et quasi laborat oratio. Pessime longae, quae easdem inter se litteras committunt, sonabunt. Praecipuus tamen erit hiatus earum, quae cavo aut patulo maxime ore efferuntur ; *e* planior littera est, *i* angustior est, ideoque obscurius in his vitium. Minus peccabit qui longis breves subiciet et adhuc qui praeponet longae brevem, minima est in duabus brevibus offensio. Atque cum aliae subiunguntur aliis, proinde asperiores erunt, prout oris habitu simili aut diverso pronuntiabuntur (Inst. IX iv 33).

-m had a different pronunciation in the time of Plautus and in the time of Cicero cannot stand. No more can Prof. Birt's theory that initial *h* was more resistive of elision in the pronunciation of Plautus' time; for Plautus scans *quī amat* just as readily as *quī homo*. Very unlikely is the view that the old Ablative suffix in -d was occasionally used by Plautus, as he occasionally uses the old Subjunctive *siet*, the old Verb-form *iurigo*, &c. (See below, p. 141.)

Like the 1 Decl. Gen. Sing. ending -as, the by-forms *homōnem* etc. (beside *homīnem* etc.), *quamde* (beside *quam*), *hōc die* (beside *hodie*), it appears to have been obsolete in the current usage of Plautus' time, except in the monosyllables (like *haud*) *med, ted* (not '*sed*'; but possibly *red*), and would be as unsuitable for his Comedies^c as, let us say, the old-fashioned disyllabic pronunciation of the ending -tion would be in an English Comedy to-day. On the other hand the early 1 Decl. Genitive ending -aī, and the old Pronominal Dative *quoī* (*cui*) seem still to have lingered on, like *utī* beside *ut*, Inf. -arier, etc., beside -ari, etc., and should often be restored to lines which have the appearance of Hiatus. It is conceivable that archaisms that were not used by Plautus may appear in post-Plautine prologues (e.g. *anticuus* in the prologue to the *Casina*, vv. 7, 13), and un-Plautine Hiatus may find a place there too (vv. 47—48, 79?), just as it appears in the Acrostic Arguments. An editor should therefore not be too hasty in ruling out Hiatus in a line of a Prologue (e.g. *Aul.* 5). In the plays themselves he must balance the probability of the Hiatus being genuine against the probability of the reading being corrupt. Where there is consensus of *PA* or of *P* with an ancient Grammarian the latter probability will be greatly reduced. His chief liability to error will be in those abnormal cases of Hiatus like the *uos quī | accolitīs* of Naevius (cited by Cicero), which occur in parts for which we have no other evidence than the Palatine

^c In *Amph.* 191 sqq. there is a parody of the grandiloquent style: ~

*Id vī et virtute militum victum atque expugnatum oppidum est
Imperio atque auspicio meī eri Amphitruonis maxume.*

Praeda atque agro | adoreaue adfecit popularis suos (P, A n.l.).

Some editors accordingly feel themselves justified in admitting the form *agrod*. I prefer to admit another usage of elevated diction, the triple *que*, and to read *praedaeque, agroque, adoreaue*. Once that a scribe had miscopied *praedaeque* as *praeda atque*, the whole corrupt version would naturally ensue.

MSS. The temptation to 'emend' these is invincible. The only safe criterion of such Hiatus will be the presence of metrical exigency, the necessity of getting certain words in a certain order into a line. Where such necessity plainly exists and plainly calls for Hiatus of an abnormal type, the editor should acquiesce in the traditional version of the line, even though he can produce no parallel example.

But to close our ears to Cicero's unimpeachable testimony to the prevalence of Hiatus in Early Poetry is surely irrational, especially when his testimony is confirmed by what we know of Saturnian Verse and of the phonetic characteristics of the Latin language. The rude versification of plebeian epitaphs and the like shews us that ordinary, unconventional diction, when not trammelled by artificial laws of Metre, acquiesced in Hiatus between words, just as literary diction itself acquiesced in Hiatus between the components of Word-groups or Compounds like *quām-obrem, tām-etsi, pr(a)ēhendo, dēhortor*. Hiatus is therefore not alien to the nature of the Latin language^d; and this being the case, we should expect to find it playing a part in the early Drama, whose verses deliberately reproduce the actual form of everyday utterance. The reaction begun by Ritschl against the old indiscriminate admission of Hiatus into Plautus' verses was a good thing, but it has been carried too far. It is contrary to all laws of textual criticism when editors continue to exercise their ingenuity in 'emending' lines whose text rests on the firmest possible basis of evidence, and treat the united testimony of the Palatine MSS., the Ambrosian Palimpsest and the citation by ancient Grammarians, in as cavalier a fashion as the single testimony of one of these three witnesses. Leo's edition in too violent reaction from this uncalled-for patching and tinkering of Plautus' lines exhibits almost every 'versus hians' in the form in which the MSS. present it. His theory is that, although nine-tenths of these instances are un-Plautine, still the lines may have had this form in the earliest collected edition of the plays, since the belief was current in the Early Empire that Hiatus was a feature of the older poetry. This treatment of the MSS. seems to me to err in the other direction,

^d The theory of the rhythmical formation of Latin Prose has not yet been fully formulated. But the recent investigations of the rhythmical sentence-endings affected by Cicero indicate that in his time a long final vowel was normally left in 'prosodic' hiatus before an initial vowel or h.

in exaggerating the authority of the Palatine MSS. Their consensus does not give us the reading of an ancient recension; far from it. It gives us merely the reading of a single Carolingian codex, a codex abounding in transpositions, omissions and misguided corrections such as characterize the work of every mediaeval scribe. We cannot treat apparently erroneous readings of this authority with the same respect as we treat the readings of an ancient authority like the Ambrosian Palimpsest. Infinitely greater respect is due to the readings supported by the consensus of *P* and *A*.

(IX.) *Orthography.*

A full discussion of the orthography of the Plautine text would require a monograph to itself. All that I aim at doing in this section is to make clear the actual facts which condition the traditional orthography of the several plays and to shew the weakness of certain arguments which ignore these. A comparison of the two recensions in point of orthography is, it will be shewn, very difficult, if not quite impossible.

The text of the plays rests, where we have not the Ambrosian Palimpsest to help us, on the mere authority of a minuscule archetype of the 8th or more likely 9th century. In certain portions, those for which we have a collation of the Codex Turnebi (*T*), it rests on the authority of a majuscule archetype, of about the same age as the Palimpsest. But in the matter of Orthography we are even worse off. For that corrector (*B*³) of the Codex Vetus (*B*), who in the first eight plays seems to have entered the readings of the minuscule archetype, where it differed from the text of this codex, did not much concern himself with the orthography of the older MS. The Palatine orthography of these eight plays rests in reality merely on the immediate original of *B* and *D*. In the remaining twelve, if the usual view be correct, that *B* and the original of *C* and *D* are immediate transcripts of the minuscule archetype, it rests upon that archetype's authority^e; while in the portions for which the collation of *T* has been preserved, it can claim, at least in a degree (for a collation is unfortunately

^e Fortunately a fairly large staff of scribes was employed on the latter part of *B* (from the *P*-plays onwards). One scribe has preserved some features of the orthography of the original, another has preserved others, and so on.

not a text), to go back to the majuscule archetype itself. It therefore stands on different levels in different portions of Plautus, and any one might, if he thought it worth while, succeed in disentangling the various threads brought into the present texture by the scribes or correctors (1) of the original of *B* and *D* in the first eight plays, (2) of the minuscule archetype, (3) of the majuscule archetype. Seldom do our MSS. of *Amph.—Epid.* (not the *Bacchides*, which now begins the second part of the Palatine archetype) retain trace of ancient spelling, unless through some misapprehension. For example in *Capt.* 887 they offer *quo iusserat* instead of *quouis erat*; and at *Asin.* 589. 593, where the corrector seems to have omitted to expunge or stroke out the older form, leaving the modern form suprascript, the supposed variant has been perpetuated in
cui

our MSS., *quoi*. He does not seem to have had the same hostility to the old spelling *vo* in *voltus*, *parvos*, etc., although the substitution of the more familiar form seldom fails to be made by one or other of the subsequent transcribers (e.g. in *Capt.* 169 *captivom* has become *captivum* in *VE*). For every mediaeval copyist was liable to correct what he conceived to be misspellings in his original^f. And so even at the highest stage of the Palatine orthography we cannot hope to find the archaic spelling of the majuscule archetype reproduced with any thoroughness. At *Pseud.* 1334 the collation (which fortunately pays some heed to orthographical details) of the *Codex Turnebi* shews *sei* where the other MSS. (*BCD*) all offer *sed*. The scribe of the minuscule archetype presumably misread *I* as *T* and wrote down *set*; the corrector then changed this to *sed*. Curiously enough at v. 1324 of the same play it is *BCD* which retain *sei*, while in *T* it appears as *sed*. So we can infer that the majuscule archetype offered the same spelling in other passages^g where our extant minuscule MSS. shew *sed* instead of *si*.

Seeing that the Palatine orthography might degenerate^h at

^f A deliberate change of *ei* to *i* is seen in readings like *Truc.* 559 *perditum sit* for *perditum se it*, *Pseud.* 242 *placidis* for *placide is*.

^g In *Aul.* 159 the substitution of *sei es* for *sed est* (*P*, *A* n.l.) seems almost required by the sense.

^h A good example is the old spelling *tostrina* which has been systematically banished. The sentence of banishment we may assign to the scribe (or corrector) of the original of *B* and *D*. For the word occurs only in the first eight

each successive transcription we can never infer that modern spellings in this or that MS. stood in its original, nor even that modern spellings (e.g. *sed* for *set*) found in a group of MSS. were so written by the scribe of the common original or archetype. For they may be due to the interference of the corrector. Nor is this uncertainty confined to mediaeval transcription. In ancient, as in mediaeval, times a scribe was always liable to alter an unfamiliar form under the idea that it was a misspelling. Varro in his *Lingua Latina* (VIII 51) felt himself compelled to limit his examples of the correct case-forms demanded by Analogy 'quod librarios haec spinosiora indiligentius elaturos putavi.' Aul. Gellius makes it abundantly clear how much care had to be taken to weed out such miswritings, in copies of early authors, as *quadrupes ecus* for *quadrupes eques* (N. A. XVIII v), (*hanc rem*) *futuram* for *futurum* (I vii), *diei* (Gen.) for *dies* (IX xiv. 6), *faciei* (Gen.) for *facies* (IX xiv. 2). We cannot therefore infer with any confidence that even the spellings found in the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*) have not been tampered with. We dare not so much as ascribe them to the immediate original of *A*, much less to the *A^a* recension itself. An unfamiliarⁱ spelling like *terrai* for *terrae* would (we might almost say, inevitably) be altered to *terrae* by most scribes or correctors at that time, if they understood that the Genitive of *terra* was meant^k. Different scribes and correctors would have different degrees of repugnance to the various archaisms found in Plautus' text; so we must not think of inferring from even so ancient testimony as that of the Palimpsest that the prominence of this play over that play in respect of the retention of archaic spellings implies that the earlier tradition of the text had been different for each play. It implies most likely nothing more than that a new scribe or a new corrector intervened. Indeed I am not sure that within the limits of the Palimpsest's text itself we do not detect something of this kind. At Trin. 181 *ussurae* is plays, six times in all. Five times it is written in our MSS. with *-nst-*, but in the sixth occurrence, Capt 266, in *tonstrina*, the word *in*, which in early minuscule is often hardly to be distinguished from *hi* or (sometimes) *bi*, was misread as *bi*. The 'ghost-word' *bitostrina* neither scribe nor corrector ventured to touch.

ⁱ Martial chooses *terrai frugiferai* as one of the most striking examples of the uncouthness of obsolete forms. (See above, p. 30.)

^k Fortunately they often mistake it for the Nominative and write *terra*, leaving us a trace of the archaism.

corrected to *usurae*, and I fancy that from this point in the play one can detect a change in the orthography. Certainly the retention of archaic forms is greater in some parts of *A* than in others, but I doubt whether we may substitute for the word 'parts' the word 'plays.'

From the presence of a modern spelling in Plautus MSS. or archetypes we can rarely venture to make any inference regarding its antiquity. It is the unfamiliar spellings, the spellings which scribes would be tempted to alter but have by some good fortune not altered, which we can refer to the old text. The frequency of the spelling *periuro* (even where the metre requires the short penult) in the Palimpsest as well as the other MSS. is not so significant as the preservation of the ancient orthography with *-er-* instead of *-ur-* in Truc. 30 and Asin. 293 (*perierat* perhaps confused with Plup. Ind. of *pereo*). On the other hand we must not be too rash in generalizing from even a respectable number of instances. There is no doubt that the editors of the large Teubner edition made a mistake in extending to all Superlatives the form *-umus*. It has lately been shewn by Dr. Brock how admirably the archetypes agree with the evidence of inscriptions in spelling *minimus*, not 'minumus' like *optumus*. To force upon *minimus* the *u* of *optumus* is like forcing on *incipio*, *recipio* the *u* of *occupo*.

That the orthography adopted by ancient texts of Plautus had a genuine claim to antiquity and, we may perhaps add, was not invariably uniform, is suggested by the Grammarians' frequent attestation of this or that spelling in this or that line. Sisenna attested *luci* (not 'luce') for Amph. 165; Priscian attests the spelling *pellucet* for Aul. 566, also *-ll-* in the compound of *per* and *lego* at Asin. 747; Charisius attests *Fide* (dative) for Aul. 667. A reference to our existing MSS. shews, as is only natural, how woefully scribes have sinned in the transcription of these unfamiliar forms which the Grammarians attest; but it is pleasing to find that here and there the archaism has managed to survive, e.g. *ted* attested¹ for Curc. 1 by Charisius and Diomedes. And a comparison of the spelling of *A* or *P* with the spelling of Plautus-citations in our MSS. of Nonius (derived, unfortunately all of them, from a minuscule archetype of perhaps the 8th century)

¹ As a rule *ted* and *med* survive in our minuscule MSS. only before *esse*, the phrase being wrongly understood as *te desse* (*te deesse*).

reveals here and there a coincidence which cannot be accidental. Thus in *Amph.* 979 monosyllabic *sis* is spelt both in Nonius and *P* as *sies*. Similarly both *A* and *P* agree very often in the spelling *quom* (sometimes in *qum*, cf. *Pers.* 442); very often in the spelling *qur*, but never, I think, in *quor*, so that the occasional appearance of the last may be nothing but a scribe's alteration of the *qur* of his original; in the spelling *aiio* at *Cas.* 71, and so on. A combination of the *exol-* of *A* and the *exsul-* of *P* at *Most.* 597 leads us to the old spelling *exsolatum*. In fact although a huge amount of details of archaic spelling must have been modernized by scribes as early as the transcription of *A* and *P* (e.g. *eiram* has become *iram* in *Truc.* 264 in both), nevertheless, owing to scribes' misunderstandings and other causes, so large a number of traces have survived that I doubt whether there was any type of archaic spelling in the ancient recensions of which all trace whatsoever has been effaced. Against *-ōs* scribes or correctors of both texts seem at one time or other to have exercised hostility (witness *eius* for *ei os* at *Pseud.* 719 in *A*, *cuius* for *cui os* at *Trin.* 558 in *P*); still a kind fortune has preserved *opos sit* (perhaps mistaken for *o possit*!) at *Stich.* 573 as late as *B* (*CD* have *possit*). That *-ce* was also banned we learn from *Pseud.* 685 *hoc venit* (*P*) for *hoc evenit* (misread as *hoce venit*), *Men.* 349 *hinc creditur* (*P*) for *hinc egreditur*, and so on. But in spite of all that we have lost, I do not know that it is too optimistic to say that by collecting and appreciating all the traces that have survived we can represent to our imagination a fairly true picture of the general style of orthography in the best ancient texts of Plautus. And this orthography has every mark of genuine transmission^m from an early time, the time apparently when learned labour was first applied to the playsⁿ. How much it retained of the actual

^m It therefore seems to me not impossible that the traces of the spelling *moenio* in the girl's remarks in *Pers.* 553 sqq. take us back to the ancient text:

SAG. Quid id quod vidisti? ut munitum muro tibi visum oppidumst?

VIR. Si incolae bene sunt moratae, id pulchre moenitum arbitror

. . . . ea urbs moenita muro (? *leg.* *moero*) sat erit simplici.

ⁿ If an editor in the earlier centuries of the Empire attempted to re-write the orthography of Plautus, he would be sure to introduce exaggerated and false archaisms. But of such we find, I think, no trace in our traditional text. There is no sure trace, for example, of a final *-d* in Ablatives. The spellings

orthography of Plautus is another matter. Our text tradition is too uncertain and the evidence of inscriptions too meagre and unsatisfactory^o to give us much confidence in attempting to restore that. Nor dare we venture to affirm this or that archaism, found in one archetype, to have been absent from the other P. For

just mentioned, *sies* for the monosyllabic form, are not of this kind. We have the evidence of actual ancient inscriptions to shew that the older spelling was often retained under circumstances which called for the later forms, and therefore Loewe's proposal to read *seis* may be rejected; certainly the present habit of editors of abandoning the disyllabic spelling in lines like Amph. 106 cannot be commended. Similarly *quom* for *cum*, the Preposition, is a frequent spelling not only in our texts of Plautus but on early inscriptions. Besides we may say that the use of *siet* where the scansion requires *sit* is quite of a piece with the use of *atque* where the scansion requires *ac*, e.g. Trin. 935, or of *quamsi* where we should print *quasi*, e.g. Pseud. 641. Cf. *surrupuit* for trisyllabic *surpuit* in Capt. 8 and perhaps *si voltis* for *sullis* Men. 350. The *-eis* (for *-is*) of *A* in *curabeis* Merc. 526, *ibeis* Cas. 92 is more suspicious, but even of this substitution of *ei* for *i* there are examples in old inscriptions; nor should we forget the possibility that a scribe, who had been lately writing a number of archaic *ei*-forms might unconsciously introduce the spelling, just as the scribe of *V* at Capt. 755 has changed the *offerre* (-ere?) *natum* of his original to *offere gnatum*.

^o A common misconception in this matter must be corrected. We are not entitled to infer that the orthography of the S. C. de Bacchanalibus was also the orthography of the Comedies. In a state document obsolete diction and archaic spelling were deliberately practised which would be quite out of place in a Comedy. Our legal style, with its e.g. 'witnesseth,' 'judgement' (instead of 'judgment'), affords plenty of examples. Nearer to Plautus' language, because rather less formal, is the inscription with the Decree of Aem. Paulus (189 B.C.), found in Spain, which, though slightly earlier than the S. C. Bacch., admits spellings of the day, e.g. *in turri Lascutana, essent, possidere*, along with the archaisms appropriate to legal documents, e.g. *posedisent*. The spelling *Troiad* in a line of Naevius' Saturnian poem is indicated by our MSS. of Servius' commentary on Virgil:

Noctu Troiad exibant capitibus optertis (*troia de MSS.*),

'shrouding their heads they passed in the night-time from 'Troy.' An archaism like this is as suitable to the elevated tone of Saturnian Epic as the archaisms introduced into their Hexameter verses by Ennius, Lucretius, or Virgil. It should, however, be noticed that only the spelling, not the pronunciation, *Troiad* is here implied, for Saturnian verse was accentual and not quantitative.

P Whether it might be possible to demonstrate a difference between the two recensions in respect of the admission of vulgar or plebeian diction (e.g. *lolarius*, *meletrix*, *glarator*, etc., in P^A) is a question worth consideration but for which there is no room in this monograph.

example, until the recent discovery of the collation of *T* with its *caussa* at Rud. 145, we should have guessed, from the entire absence of this form (which is fairly well retained by *A*) from our minuscule MSS., that the older spelling was peculiar to the *A*^a recension. The evidence of *T* shews us that it was merely the scribe (or corrector) of the minuscule archetype who banished the form from the Palatine text, and suggests that the same interference is responsible for the similar absence of *essurio*, etc.⁹

§ 7. Conclusion.

We have seen how the Revival of the Plautine Drama a generation or more after the poet's death caused a parting of the ways of text-tradition. Henceforth there were roughly speaking two rival texts of the plays, the one adhering to the genuine 'ipsa verba' of the poet, the other exhibiting all the alterations, curtailments or amplifications introduced by the stage-managers of the

⁹ An editor who sets himself to reproduce exactly the orthography of the ancient text of Plautus has a difficult course to steer between Scylla and Charybdis. Leo follows the MSS., or rather the collation printed in the apparatus criticus of the large Teubner edition (which in the earlier plays sometimes fails to notice a spelling like *captivom*, etc.), and so prints in the first eight plays the modernized orthography of a mediaeval scriptorium. The Teubner editors, recognizing the tendency of scribes and correctors to make a wholesale removal of certain unusual types of spelling, e.g. *-ust* for *-us est*, disregard in these cases the evidence of the MSS. and print *-ust* wherever the metre does not require *-us est*. Now *-ust* was the form of rapid, *-us est* of more deliberate utterance, and it is quite possible that the nuance of expression has been correctly retained by the MSS. at Men. 433 :

MESS. Quid eo opust? MEN. Opus est— MESS. Scio, ut ne dicas.

MEN. Tanto nequior!

It would be a useful piece of work if some student who has leisure would collect all the indications of the actual orthography of *-ust*, *-us est*, whether supplied by MSS. or metre, also those of the orthography, or at least pronunciation, of Plautus which are afforded by puns or (more frequently) by assonance and alliteration. The difficult question of assimilation or non-assimilation in Compounds would be greatly facilitated by a collection of instances like Amph. prol. 13; haec ut me voltis adprobare, adnitier; Amph. 993 adsto, admoneo; Asin. 657 colloca cruminam in collo plane. Bacch. 276 Quin tu audi. Immo ingenium au(i)di haud pernoram hospitibus supports haud before a consonant; Merc. 68 rus rusum confestim exigi solitum a patre, supports *rusum*, &c., &c.

Revival time in order to make the performance pleasing to the audience of the day. Further in the case of single lines here and there, where a puzzling word or phrase occurred, the labours of Grammarians and Antiquarians often resulted in the production of two or three variants. We have traced the history of the rival texts down through the last century of the Republic, the Augustan Age and the Early Empire until the period of the Grammarians whose works have survived, Nonius, Charisius, etc. This period is also, roughly speaking, the period of the Ambrosian Palimpsest, which appears to preserve the main features of the 'genuine' text, and of that majuscule archetype, from which the other family of MSS. is sprung. This archetype (*P*) exhibits the 'Revival' modifications often with 'mixture,' usually with addition^r of the 'genuine' version. How far the latter features are on the one hand due to marginal insertions by owners of successive copies, or on the other were actually present in the *P*^A-recension (which would then have presented something of the appearance of a 'variorum' edition) it is hard to say. Although the distinctive features of both recensions have undoubtedly been a good deal blurred by 'mixture,' we have seen that a study of the divergent readings of *A* and *P* leaves the impression rather of two different editions which had in many passages been assimilated through the adoption by one of some readings of the other, than of two copies of the same edition which were beginning to exhibit points of dissimilarity. But intertwined and intertwined as the threads of our text-tradition appear, they can always be resolved into these two, (1) the 'genuine' text, (2) the 'Revival' text. There is nothing that indicates the re-writing of the verses by late editors (from the second century A.D. onwards) in the fashion that they were re-written by the Italian editors of the Renaissance. Where we have not the 'ipsa verba' of Plautus, we seem to have the adapted version of the 'Revival' period, a period not later than a generation or two after the poet's time.

In the latter part of last century the view steadily gained ground

^r A very fortunate practice for us. Otherwise we should have lost the 'genuine' version in parts for which the evidence of *AA* was wanting. We should have lost, e.g., *Asin.* 23—24, and have had in their place the mere 'Revival' substitute, vv. 25—26, without that interesting Old Latin allusion to the custom of coming out of the house into the open air for an oath by *Dius Fidius*.

that the errors (or apparent errors) common to *A* and *P* prove them to be two divergent copies of one and the same edition. This view, which I have tried to combat on pp. 104—118 above, has recently culminated in the theory stated by Profr. Leo in the first chapter of his 'Plautinische Forschungen,' viz., that the writings of Plautus disappeared in the Early Empire for something like half a century, and were recovered in the provinces by the Grammarian Valerius Probus, and that with the help of the copies which he brought from the provinces to Rome the first collected edition of the plays was made, an edition limited to the 21 'fabulae Varronianae.' Both *A* and *P* are, he says, divergent copies of this edition.

Before a startling theory like this can be accepted, definite proof of its truth is needed. Let us see how Leo arrives at his conclusions. In the first place he takes quite literally the words of Suetonius (quoted above, p. 31) regarding the decay of the study of the earlier writers, and endeavours by a reference to the conflagrations in Nero's and in Titus' reigns to account for the absence of so important an author as Plautus from the public libraries in Rome. Next he makes up as imposing a list as possible of the errors or apparent errors that are common to *A* *P*, pressing into service such miswritings as these mentioned above on p. 105, and even modernized orthography like *-ae* for *-ai* in the Gen. Sing. of the First Declension. He declares the common source of the *A*^A and *P*^A recensions to have been a 'variorum' edition in which doubtful lines, interpolations, &c., were all incorporated in the text and merely indicated by diacritical symbols.^s But he lays chief stress on the extent to which Hiatus is present in our traditional text. An editor in the second century A.D. would, he says, readily tolerate^t Hiatus, because it was believed at the time (witness

^s This explanation would suit the appearance of *A* and *P* in some cases, e.g. in the two versions of the *Poenulus* ending, which both stand in the text of *A* and *P* in the same order. But in most cases their appearance gives indication of an intrusion into the text from the margin. To me this suggests rather 'mixture' of text by successive owners.

^t His line of argument here is not clear. He mentions Cicero's statement that the early poets 'saepe hiabant.' The instances quoted by Cicero, e.g. Naevius' *vos qui | accolitis* and *Graii | atque barbari*, etc., are certainly not less striking than the instances Leo quotes from our traditional text of Plautus. If then Cicero and his contemporaries tolerated these, regarding them as peculiarities of early poetry, why should the toleration of them in an edition of Plautus assign the edition rather to the age of Probus than of Cicero?

the Acrostic Arguments and contemporary archaistic (?) epitaphs) that Hiatus was a feature of Archaic poetry. And he makes an interesting, but too brief examination of the different plays in respect to the amount of 'illegitimate' Hiatus (i.e. such as the text of Terence does not exhibit), making this a test of the merit of the text-tradition in the several plays. These are, I think, the main props on which the theory rests; but the details are filled in with such fulness and skill and the whole theory is set forth with such learning and ingenuity and with so great a wealth of illustration from Greek literature, that I do not think any unprejudiced person can read with attention the whole of the first chapter of Leo's book and pronounce the theory to be utterly impossible^u. All that can be said is that so revolutionary a theory requires very strong evidence to support it, and that the available evidence is not strong enough. Whether the theory ultimately hold the field or not, there is no doubt of the permanent benefit conferred on Plautine studies by this brilliant chapter, and this chapter is by no means the best in Leo's epoch-making volume.

After all there is a certain amount of common ground for rival theories. Everyone must admit that the revival of the older literature at the time of Probus would likely be marked by a re-editing of the old dramatists, Plautus and Terence^x. The individual copies (*A* and *P*) of two booksellers' issues, derived

^u The point which to me seems most difficult to believe is that Probus could find no materials for an edition in the libraries of Rome or other towns of Italy. Gellius speaks of a copy of Claudius Quadrigarius preserved in the library of Tibur, and of his having found the genuine old spelling *facies* (Gen.) in its text. (See above, p. 32.) Why may not the same library (cf. N.A. XIX v. 4) have preserved an old copy of Plautus? From Suetonius' words (see p. 31) we gather that Probus while at Berytus had read (*legerat*) some old literature which first directed his inclination to this field of study, and that afterwards he got together a number of copies (*multa exemplaria contraxit*) of the older authors as materials for editions of their writings. Surely Probus and his friends would hunt through the libraries of Italy as zealously as the Renaissance scholars did. However this is perhaps a minor point. It matters little where Probus got his materials for an edition of Plautus. The main point is whether the materials were sufficient for turning out a good edition. None of the examples which Leo cites of the tinkering of corrupt and defective passages by a second century editor seem to me at all conclusive.

^x Leo does not make out Terence to have been lost and resuscitated like Plautus.

mediately or immediately from two recensions, A^A and P^A, have left us no clue like the 'Calliopius recensui' of Terence MSS. On the strength of *A* being a codex of a N. Italian library and the majuscule archetype *P* apparently of a French library, we are induced to locate the two booksellers' issues in Italy and Gaul respectively. The date may be any time not later (at least in the case of the *A*-issue) than the fourth century. They would be likely (one or both of them) to have closer ties of connexion with a second century edition than with any belonging to the Republican age, just as any edition, let us say, of Lucretius published after Probus' time would be likely to retain what had been won for the text by that scholar's labours. If we suppose Probus to have procured a sufficient number of copies, embodying, either in pure or in 'mixed' form, the two divergent types of text, the 'genuine' and the 'Revival' text, and some scholar to have constructed out of these materials, more or less blended, an edition or editions which in time led to fresh booksellers' issues, there is nothing in all this supposition which cannot commend itself to all parties. Opposition becomes necessary only when a theory is asserted with a confidence of which the evidence at our disposal does not allow, whether the theory be that the first collected edition of the plays was made (1) in the time of Varro, or (2) in the time of Probus, or else (the prevailing theory, I am afraid) that both our recensions, A^A and P^A, come from one and the same 'variorum' edition (whether that belonged^γ to Varro's or Probus' time or to the Augustan age). The evidence is not, in my opinion, sufficient either to establish or to destroy any of these hypotheses^z. All that

^γ The acceptance of the prevalent view regarding the errors common to *A* and *P* seems to me almost to preclude the possibility of a date earlier than Probus. Consider for a moment the reading common to *A* and to our minuscule MSS. at Epid. 455, *centones farcias* instead of *c. sarcias*. This error I believe (see p. 113) to have been made by the scribes of the two texts independently, in the one case owing to the close resemblance of *s* to *f* in minuscule script. But the prevalent view ascribes it to the (supposed) common original of A^A and P^A. How then can a patent miswriting like this have persisted in ancient texts (of course it would not be patent to mediaeval scribes) for any length of time? The presence of such obvious miswritings in the Codex Vetus (*B*) as *kaec*, *koc* for *haec*, *hoc*, due to misreading of the Rustic Capital form of *H*, is admitted evidence for the close proximity of *B* to the majuscule archetype *P*. The same reasoning must hold good for corruptions like *centones farcias*.

^z Nor yet this other, which has more in its favour, viz. that P^A represents

can be said is that the balance of probability inclines against the third.

Nor, so far as I can see, should it alter any of the approved methods of Plautine textual criticism, if the theory were to be provisionally accepted (though unproved) that Plautus' plays were actually lost to the world for some 50 years and were actually recovered in provincial book-stalls and finally published in a 'variorum' edition (containing careful record of the two divergent forms of text) by Probus himself or by a pupil or friend of his. Why then, I may be asked, do I think it necessary to emphasize the uncertainty of this theory? Because I am convinced that the unquestioned acceptance of it is likely to lead to mischievous results. Sooner or later the feeling would arise that our traditional text of Plautus is nothing, after all, but a concoction of the second century A.D., and differs from the real text as much as we may suppose that a second century restoration of an inscription of Plautus' time would differ from the real inscription. It is true that Leo points out that Probus and his school would shew great carefulness and fidelity in combining the newly discovered materials into an edition. For all that, he himself in the matter of Hiatus seems to despair of arriving by the help of the traditional text at or near to Plautus' own usage. He adheres to the old idea that Plautus still pronounced the final *d* of Ablatives and final *m* (not, I think, initial *h*) in such a way that *auspicio* | *hodie* | *optumo* and *murem* | *abstulit* produced no hiatus in the verse; and he supposes that cases like these would open the way to the intrusion of a host of un-Plautine types of Hiatus into the ancient traditional text. So he assigns to the edition of Probus' time the cases of Hiatus which are attested merely by the Carolingian^a archetype of the Palatine MSS. as readily as the cases attested by the consensus of *AP*, indicating all in the same way by the apex-symbol. For example, in *Amph.* 263 he refuses the obvious emendation of *illi* to *illic* and prints: *ibo ego illi óbiviam*. All this is, I fear, likely

a 'variorum' edition made in the second century A.D., while *AA* represents the edition of some Plautine scholar in the last century of the Republic or the first of the Empire.

^a An example will illustrate how readily 'Hiatus' may step in at each new transcription. *Curc.* 229 appeared in the original of *EVJ* as: *Quis hic est qui loquitur? Quoiām vocem | audio?* But *B* has preserved the reading of the common original of *BEVJ*: *quoiām vocem ego audio?*

to have something of a paralysing effect upon students and to retard rather than stimulate new discoveries in Plautine Prosody and Plautine Accidence. And it is mainly with the view of exposing the weakness of much of the evidence on which the new theory rests that I have written this monograph^b.

In time we shall probably get clear light thrown on these dark corners of the history of the Plautine text. Perhaps the discoveries in Egypt of one or more of Plautus' Greek originals will change the situation. But even if Egypt brings us nothing, there are still plenty of things^c in which patient investigation will win certainty for us. We are yet far from the ultimate stage of research. We have yet to learn the full details of the Metres used by Plautus and of the restrictions under which he used them. We do not yet fully know Plautine Accidence; for example, whether Plautus used the form *eapsa* as well as *ipsa* and *eapse*, or how far by-forms^d

^b I wished to state the case, the 'conservative' or 'optimist' case, clearly and connectedly, rather than to put it in the form of a polemic against this or that theory. So the various items of evidence have been left to follow their own natural order without express reference to the position they hold in other theories. For instance, Varro's quotation (ap. Fest. 375 M.) of Curc. 568, which is often adduced in evidence that the text of Plautus in Varro's time contained errors which were removed by the editors of Probus' time, appears in my monograph (in the Varro-section, p. 8) merely in this form:

"Vapula ergo (*leg.* Vapulare ego) te vehementer iubeo, ne me
territes (P, A n.l.),"

because I could not bring myself to believe that *vapula ergo* was anything more than a mere error of the scribe of our MS. of Festus, influenced possibly by the *vapula* in Varro's preceding quotation of Terence. Varro is not attesting the Imperative *vapula*: he is explaining the proverb *vapula Papiria* by an appeal to the postulated O. Lat. use of *vapulare* in the sense of *perire*.

^c It is disappointing to find that Semitic scholars have done nothing with the improvements furnished by the new collation of the Codex Turnebi in the Carthaginian passage in the Poenulus (published in the Classical Review, XII 361, five years ago). It would greatly help us if the two versions could be satisfactorily dated and discriminated.

^d The theory that Plautus allowed elision of final *s* (after a short vowel) before initial vowels (or *h*) indiscriminately, can hardly, I imagine, be accepted by any one. It conflicts too violently with the text of the plays. It is impossible, for example, to believe that in such a line as Rud. 888 Plautus would scan *collus haud multo post erit* in the same way as *collum haud multo post erit*. It has always seemed to me that, before this theory can be considered worthy of discussion, it must state its own limits and conditions.

in *-ē* (e.g. *sedeate* Poen. 5 ?) appeared beside forms in *-īs*. Nor yet Plautine Prosody; e.g. whether Plautus recognized (1) *hōdie*, *nēsei* (cf. Brock), &c. (like *siquidem* beside *siquidem*, *quā(m)si* beside *quāsi*), (2) *hūius* (trisyll., like *illius*; cf. Sommer 'Handbuch,' p. 454 n.), (3) *siquis*, etc. (Bacch. 976 suggests that this scansion was unknown to Plautus), (4) *nihilum* (*-i*, etc.). Nor yet Plautine Grammar; e.g. whether the construction of an Acc. Case with an Impersonal Passive Verb is Plautine (see above, p. 117). And Leo's suggestion, that the traditional text in some plays^o is (and was at the time of Probus) less sound than in others, should be fully followed up. Before it can be established, a full record must be compiled of the extent to which all kinds of questionable usages are present, not merely unusual types of Hiatus, but also such things as (1) the shortening under the Breves Breviantes Law of naturally long syllables or of syllables beginning with *qu* or with a mute and a liquid, (2) the total absorption by elision of *meo*, *cui*, *mei*, etc. (*rei* seems certain), (3) contractions like *haecst*, *illicst*, *rest* (Merc. 857, etc.) for *res est*.

One by one these and other moot points will be decided, and

Meanwhile there is undoubtedly something attractive in a combination like *sequeris* and *sequere*, *potis* and *pote*, *magis* and *mage*, *satis* and *sat(e)*, which suggests extension of the same phonetic variety to *pluris* (*-re*) in Pers. 353, *panis* (*-ne*) in Curc. 367, *aetatis* (*-te*) in Trin. 1090 (cf. Trin. 1153). *Potest* (for *potis* 'st, as well as for *pote* 'st) too now appears in a new light, and the point of Cist. 573 *Servate di med obsecro. At me perditis*. But even in this particular matter, the recognition by Roman Orthography of the weak pronunciation of *s* in the final syllable *-is* (before a consonant?), there is still uncertainty. For example, did *salutis est*, *nimis est*, become in rapid utterance *salutest*, *nimest*, or *salutist*, *nimist*? And should we print *magis* (*magi*?) or *mage*, where the word has pyrrich scansion, e.g. Curc. 171? (Cf. *ipsu* Curc. 170 and *ipse*).

^o Leo's assumption that the corrupt state of the text of the *Truculentus* in our (minuscule) MSS. must date from ancient times is certainly unwarranted. The little that we have of the Palimpsest for this play exhibits a good enough text. In the *American Journal of Philology* (XVII 442) I have tried to shew that the curious change from a good to a bad text in *B C D* at the beginning of the *Truculentus* is exactly what would happen if there was at this point in the minuscule archetype a change of scribe, like the change that we often see in 8th—9th century MSS., the concluding portions of which have been penned by a monk trained in a different school of penmanship, and using unfamiliar abbreviations and ligatures (e.g. Truc. 2 *deūeris* for *de vestris*).

the text thereby be so well established as perhaps to allow an unqualified answer to the problems discussed in this monograph. For the present, on the strength of the evidence collected in the preceding pages, the duties of an editor of Plautus I take to be :

(1) To adhere to the consensus of *A* and *P*, unless there is evidence of scribes having fallen independently into the same error. The consensus gives us at the worst the text as established by the labours of Probus and his school (and that is a great deal), at the best the traditional text of the last century of the Republic.

(2) To give little or no credence to the chance Plautus-citations by a Grammarian, where they differ from our MSS., unless it appear that he took them directly from a text of the plays. On the other hand,

(3) To give all possible credence to Grammarians' attestations of unusual words, forms or spellings ; for there was every chance of these being altered to the normal shape by copyists at some period or other of the text's transmission.

ADDENDUM (to pp. 26 and 85).

Nonius' copy of Plautus may have been not a single volume, but a collection of separate papyrus rolls ; so that, in excerpting the plays composing the several letter-groups, he may have followed an order of his own and not the order assigned by a publisher. In excerpting Lucilius xxvi—xxx he begins from the end (xxx, xxix, xxviii, xxvii, xxvi).

INDEX OF LINES DISCUSSED.

- Amph. 106, p. 141; 193, p. 134; 208, p. 120; 275, p. 5, p. 127; 488, p. 5; 523, p. 86; 1067-8, p. 79.
- Asin. 23-6, p. 38; 32 sqq., p. 38; 47-8, p. 38; 480 sqq., p. 48; 685, p. 5; 706, p. 122; 755 sqq., p. 128; 828-9, p. 48; 894 sqq., p. 49.
- Aul. 5, p. 134; 116, p. 25; 159, p. 137; 161-4, p. 35, p. 18; 178, p. 30; 328, p. 89; 354-5, p. 18; 399, p. 26; 446, p. 5; 555, p. 17; 592-8, p. 49; 703, p. 128; 829, p. 92.
- Bacch. 51, p. 123; 65 sqq., p. 49; 134, p. 123; 377-8, p. 38; 379-81, p. 38; 382-3, p. 38; 392 sqq., p. 38; 487, p. 105; 495, p. 126; 496, p. 69; 506, p. 57; 512-4, p. 50; 519, p. 58; 530, p. 131; 540-551, p. 38; 558, p. 131; 932, p. 117; 946, p. 125; 948, p. 69; 1150, p. 35; 1207, p. 83.
- Capt. 524-5, p. 79; 1016-23, p. 39.
- Cas. 7, p. 134; 13, p. 134; 47-8, p. 134; 72, p. 109; 79, p. 134; 126, p. 131; 137, p. 58; 185 sqq., p. 49; 206, p. 3; 267, p. 26; 347, p. 94; 443, p. 19; 550, p. 126; 564, p. 131; 571, p. 117; 625, p. 116; 636, p. 69; 646, p. 109; 666, p. 130; 727, p. 64; 747, p. 69; 749, p. 69; 769, p. 58; 782, p. 126; 800, p. 83; 839, p. 117; 960, p. 94; 1004, p. 131.
- Cist. Arg. 10, p. 87; 1, p. 6; 8, p. 6; 84, p. 58; 126 sqq., p. 39; 132, p. 58; 408, p. 15; 510-11, p. 50; 518, p. 92; 573, p. 149.
- Curc. 367, p. 149; 393, p. 7 sq.; 424, p. 78; 455 sqq., p. 50; 568, p. 148; fin., p. 83.
- Epid. 9 sqq., p. 79; 164-5, p. 40; 173-4, p. 79; 187, p. 27; 189-90, p. 102; 214, p. 131; 231, p. 8; 235, p. 59; 455, p. 113; 515, p. 58; 568, p. 113; 606, p. 59; 620, p. 15, p. 59; 621, p. 69; 624, p. 70; 732, p. 83; 733, p. 59.
- Men. 12, p. 22; 94, p. 25; 127, p. 8; 151, p. 92; 200-1, p. 79, p. 109; 223, p. 131; 289, p. 17; 349, p. 140; 352, p. 81, p. 115; 360, p. 50; 433, p. 142; 476, p. 125; 519, p. 130; 572, p. 59; 573, p. 112; 587, p. 59; 639^a, p. 51; 854, p. 78; 882, p. 125; 1028 sqq., p. 51; 1047, p. 9; 1151, p. 131.
- Merc. 251, p. 60; 256, p. 60; 257, p. 123; 259, p. 125; 269 sq., p. 40; 271, p. 60; 276, p. 41; 285, p. 62; 300, p. 107; 301, p. 60; 312, p. 128; 314, p. 60; 319, p. 70; 371-2, p. 61; 475, p. 70; 530, p. 126; 538, p. 125; 547, p. 41; 555, p. 41; 598, p. 114; 619, p. 9; 619-24, p. 51; 757, p. 70; 765, p. 70; 767, p. 61; 842-3, p. 114.
- Mil. 4, p. 131; 24, p. 9; 149, p. 108; 173, p. 92; 176, p. 70; 209, p. 61; 213, p. 22; 254, p. 117; 276, p. 92; 351, p. 105; 357, p. 33; 359, p. 61; 472, p. 61; 591, p. 112; 599, p. 71; 604, p. 131; 716, p. 71; 727-9, p. 109; 762, p. 71; 945-6, p. 71; 997^a, p. 41; 1054, p. 115; 1136, p. 131; 1138, p. 92, p. 102; 1142, p. 61; 1180, p. 16, p. 61; 1273, p. 51; 1287-9, p. 51; 1419, p. 116.
- Most. 93 sqq., p. 51; 245, p. 10; 409 sqq., p. 41; 580, p. 118; 583, p. 126; 605, p. 71; 675, p. 123; 681, p. 71; 682, p. 106; 688, p. 71; 714, p. 72; 719, p. 92; 750, p. 92; 762, p. 72; 768, p. 105; 817-47, p. 42; 832, p. 106; 928, p. 72; 939 sqq., p. 42; 976, p. 125; 984, p. 118; 1000 sqq., p. 52; 1032, p. 127; 1043, p. 109; 1103-4, p. 34.
- Pers. 20, p. 72; 171, p. 72; 179, p. 72; 262, p. 131; 269, p. 72; 319, p. 105; 321, p. 73; 353, p. 149; 408, p. 107; 413, p. 125; 437, p. 73; 463, p. 78; 483, p. 129; 499, p. 42; 515-6, p. 73; 537, p. 123; 553 sqq., p. 140; 556, p. 128; 572, p. 105; 574, p. 73; 597, p. 61; 617, p. 127; 666 sq., p. 52; 685, p. 130; 696, p. 126; 709, p. 73; 738, p. 130.
- Poen. 5, p. 149; 89, p. 126; 121 sqq., p. 43; 140, p. 92; 163-4, p. 73; 217 sqq., p. 52; 300 sqq., p. 53; 328, p. 132; 331, p. 117; 342-3, p. 62; 365, p. 33, p. 106; 390, p. 53; 443, p. 127; 448, p. 132;

- 453 sqq., p. 133; 457^{a-b}, p. 54; 474, p. 92, p. 115, p. 126; 485 sqq., p. 133, 497, p. 123; 530, p. 10; III i (vv. 543-6, 567-77), p. 54; 648, p. 73; 651, p. 130; 669, p. 105; 670, p. 115; 685, p. 125; 694, p. 128; 706 sqq., p. 44; 746, p. 33; 782, p. 132; 862, p. 131; 876, p. 105; IV ii fin. (vv. 917 sqq.), p. 54; 930, p. 28; 930 sqq., p. 44; 969, p. 109; 982, p. 132; 988, p. 123; 1005, p. 112; 1009, p. 125; 1042 sqq., p. 44; 1051, p. 112; 1113, p. 125; 1116, p. 112; 1127, p. 127; 1130, p. 131; 1168, p. 116; 1225, p. 112; 1246, p. 132; 1249, p. 73; 1252, p. 73; 1272, p. 109; 1295, p. 132; 1302, p. 105; 1317, p. 107; 1327, p. 132; 1332, p. 62; 1333-5, p. 44; fin., p. 44.
- Pseud. I-2, p. 2; 26, p. 130; 43, p. 107; 44, p. 128; 85, p. 62; 91, p. 73; 98, p. 105; 116, p. 114; 132, p. 111; 140, p. 74; 151, p. 132; 153, p. 132; 178, p. 34; 223, p. 62; 232, p. 107; 235, p. 31; 298, p. 62; 306, p. 117; 307, p. 66; 315, p. 62; 317, p. 123; 319, p. 123; 321, p. 74; 346, p. 123; 349, p. 128; 355, p. 105; 372, p. 45; 376, p. 74; 378, p. 74; 381, p. 114; 383, p. 74; 385, p. 74; 389, p. 63; 392, p. 45; 393, p. 105; 397, p. 63; 409, p. 114; 410, p. 132; 417, p. 107; 421, p. 74; 424, p. 128; 432, p. 63; 433, p. 45; 442, p. 117; 443, p. 109; 485, p. 114; 523-4, p. 46; 527, p. 114; 573^a, p. 74; 600, p. 114; 627, p. 118; 631, p. 74; 637, p. 75; 641, p. 141; 657, p. 75; 669, p. 63; 673, p. 125; 683, p. 105; 685, p. 140; 700, p. 63; 713, p. 75; 718, p. 75; 723, p. 75; 740, p. 31; 762, p. 133; 788, p. 114; 864, p. 63; 880, p. 110; 889, p. 75; 890, p. 125; 897, p. 132; 901, p. 64; 908, p. 81; 939, p. 81; 954, p. 92; 955, p. 4; 975, p. 110; 997, p. 64; 1073, p. 114; 1121, p. 123; 1131, p. 81; 1142, p. 107; 1172, p. 34; 1175, p. 64; 1205-7, p. 79; 1207, p. 110; 1220, p. 64; 1294, p. 64; 1295, p. 64; 1299, p. 64; 1306, p. 105; 1315, sqq., p. 81; 1320-1, p. 81; 1329-30, p. 80; 1331, p. 122.
- Rud. II, p. 121; 525, p. 22; 526 sqq., p. 127; 577, p. 75; 787, p. 75; 888, p. 148; 1226, p. 65.
- Stich. 48 sqq., p. 46; 77, p. 65; 94, p. 75; 140, p. 75; 152, p. 123; 157, p. 46; 161 sqq., p. 55; 165, p. 106; 166, p. 65; 167, p. 107; 171, p. 132; 174 sqq., p. 55; 1180, p. 128; 208^a, p. 55; 216, p. 128; 221, p. 125; 223, p. 117; 234, p. 130; 235, p. 132; 237, p. 65; 243, p. 117; 253-4, p. 55; 255, p. 65; 262, p. 66; 270, p. 125; 282, p. 115; 344, p. 132; 357, p. 118; 371, p. 75; 373, p. 66; 374, p. 132; 384, p. 109; 389, p. 112; 390-1, p. 66; 451, p. 75; 455, p. 107; 459 sqq., p. 133; 477, p. 132; 483-5, p. 56; 489, p. 128; 523, p. 107; 542, p. 92; 586, p. 66; 620, p. 116; 631, p. 66; 688, p. 56; 704, p. 111.
- Trin. 41, p. 105; 48, p. 126; 61, p. 76; 70, p. 67; 72 sqq., p. 56; 88, p. 76; 185, p. 125; 186, p. 76; 214, p. 76; 238^a, p. 67; 250, p. 27; 251, p. 76; 255, p. 67; II ii, p. 83; 328, p. 67; 335, p. 76; 340, p. 35; 362-8, p. 47; 448-9, p. 76; 452, p. 76; 456, p. 76; 495, p. 92; 509, p. 112; 530, p. 104; 537, p. 76; 539-40, p. 132; 560, p. 77; 720, p. 72; 743, p. 77; 747, p. 77; 773, p. 105; 788, p. 47; 839, p. 27, p. 77; 886, p. 11; 901, p. 56; 931, p. 92; 935, p. 141; 1064, p. 67; 1071, p. 107; 1090, p. 149; 1153, p. 149.
- Truc. 22, p. 11; 73, p. 77; 120, p. 82; 123, p. 82; 152, p. 82; 189, p. 77; 197, p. 68; 200, p. 130; 202, p. 77; 203, p. 82; 209, p. 83; 238, p. 68; 245, p. 68; 246 sqq., p. 47; 259, p. 77; 261, p. 107; 271, p. 15; 281, p. 77; 289-90, p. 68; 304-5, p. 78; 323, p. 11; 363, p. 107; 369, p. 68; 374, p. 68; 375, p. 69; 378, p. 78; 381, p. 78; 577, p. 104; 690, p. 92.

